Challenges of European Spatial Development: Young Professionals' and Researchers' Perspectives: European Young Professionals' Forum ; Conference Documentation, 12-13/10/2010, Mannheim, Germany

ACADEMY
FOR SPATIAL RESEARCH
AND PLANNING

LEIBNIZ FORUM FOR SPATIAL SCIENCES

European Young Professionals' Forum

Conference Documentation

Challenges of European Spatial Development: Young Professionals' and Researchers' Perspectives

12 – 13/10/2010
Mannheim, Germany

In cooperation with

Leibniz-Institut für ökologische Raumentwicklung

SPECTRA Centre of Excellence

IRS Leibniz-Institut für Regionalentwicklung und Strukturplanung

University of Southern Denmark

Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde

ACADEMY
FOR SPATIAL RESEARCH
AND PLANNING
LEIBNIZ FORUM FOR SPATIAL SCIENCES

Academy for Spatial Research and Planning
Hohenzollernstraße 11
30161 Hannover
Germany
Tel. +49 511 / 348 42 – 0
Fax +49 511 / 348 42 – 41
Email: arl@arl-net.de
www.arl-net.de

Coordinating staff of the European
Young Professionals' Forum:

Dr. Andreas Klee: klee@arl-net.de,
Head of central department
Sara Reimann: reimann@arl-net.de,
Project coordinator
Lina Trautmann: trautmann@arl-net.de,
Student assistant

Photographs and images:
Academy for Spatial Research and Planning,
if not mentioned otherwise

Project supported by:
Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and
Structural Planning (Erkner, Germany), www.irs-net.de
Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography
(Leipzig, Germany), www.ifl-leipzig.com
Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional
Development (Dresden, Germany), www.ioer.de
SPECTRA Centre of Excellence (Bratislava, Slovakia),
www.spectra-perseus.sk
Syddansk Universitet (Sonderborg, Denmark),
www.sdu.dk

May 2011

CONTENT

Example of the ARL's European activities

ARL's Position Paper on "Territorial Cohesion"*: Looking at four dimensions of a complex topic in a European context.

* Böhme, Kai; Eser, Thiemo W.; Gaskell, Frank; Gustedt, Evelyn (2008): The Territorial Cohesion Principles. Position paper to the EU Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. = Position Paper No. 78 of the Academy for Spatial Research and Planning – ARL. Hannover.

FOREWORD

The first European Young Professionals' Forum (EYF) – Successful cooperation of young professionals and senior experts

Documenting bilateral and multilateral regional and spatial studies

As Secretary-General of the German Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL) I am very glad to be able to present the documentation of the international conference "Challenges of European spatial development: Young Professionals' and Researchers' perspectives" to the general public. This conference marks the end of the first European Young Professionals' Forum (EYF) that took place from June 2009 to October 2010 joining a network of researchers and practitioners, senior experts and young professionals from all over Europe. The EYF has been the successful endea-vour of the ARL and its partners to link two important goals: To support young professionals in their early career in spatial planning and research and to broaden the international networks of the institutions involved. This documentation will illustrate the remarkable outcome of this programme: A diverse range of bilateral and multilateral regional and spatial studies connecting not only European academic and professional knowledge but also institutions and individuals.

Supporting young professionals

The European Young Professionals' Forum was carried out with five cooperating institutions and is part of the Academy's scheme to especially support young professionals and researchers. By offering different programmes we accompany them before and after graduating from university, during their PhD-studies or in the first years of their professional careers. Nationally – for example – we are organising a mentoring programme for young women especially. At the same time the ARL-network includes the German "Young Forum" – a network for those under the age of 35 interested in topics of spatial development and planning.

European activities of the ARL

Our Academy has been involved in issues of spatial development in Europe for a long time. In recent years the Academy has made a special effort of broadening its network internationally. Just to give a brief idea in what ways our members and networks are involved in European research and political processes, some examples:

- Initiated by the Academy an international ad-hoc-working group was involved in the public consultation process for the Green Paper on "Territorial Cohesion" by the European Commission. Together they wrote a position paper presenting their views on the most important aspects of Territorial Cohesion.
- Another project that we are working on currently is "Baltic Climate", financed within the framework of the European Regional Development Fund. 25 project partners from 8 countries are developing tools that help municipalities and local actors to deal with climate change issues.
- Experts from around 7 different countries meet in our working group on European planning systems. Their objective is to compare administrative and political systems and processes in order to understand how they affect spatial development on a transnational level.

A colourful experience made possible with the support of partner institutes

Apart from our international efforts we have a long-standing cooperation with German institutes who are part of a closely linked national network also cooperating in other areas (see p. 6). Without their support this project would not have been realised. But I would like to especially thank our cooperation partners from Denmark, the Netherlands, Slovakia and Sweden. They put a lot of effort and time into this project making it a truly unique and colourful experience for all participants.

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Dietmar Scholich
Secretary-General
Academy for Spatial Research and Planning

The Forum and its partner institutions

The Academy for Spatial Research and Planning (ARL) is the lead partner of the European Young Professionals' Forum. General guidelines are agreed upon with the five partner institutions supporting the forum in form of a steering committee:



- Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning (Erkner, Germany)
- Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography (Leipzig, Germany)
- Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development (Dresden, Germany)
- SPECTRA Centre of Excellence (Bratislava, Slovakia)
- Syddansk Universitet (Sønderborg, Denmark)

Professor Bernhard Müller

Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development, Dresden, Germany

Going international with the German 4R-Network: Cooperating successfully to support future generations

As director of the Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development (IÖR) I am happy that we were able to support the EYF as part of the 4R-Network in Germany to establish this new path in the assistance of young professionals.

The 4R-Network, consisting of four institutes of the Leibniz Association dealing with spatial science, constitutes an efficient and unique competence network of spatial research in Germany. The partners involved conduct research into social and physical structures on different scales. Amongst others the aim is to promote effective controlling and planning of spatial development and to give recommendations for a socially and environmentally sound development. Therefore all partners regularly join forces to cooperate in projects that are of mutual interest, one being the support of future generations of researchers and planners to broaden their horizon in an international context – the EYF.

During the conference I was able to contribute my personal expertise on issues of demographic change which is one of the biggest challenges at present and in the future. It was therefore especially rewarding to share my knowledge with a young audience – passing on insights acquired in a long career and gaining new perspectives through the exchange.

Activities and publications: http://www.ioer.de/1/ioer-overview/staff/mueller/
4R-Network: http://www.4r-netzwerk.de/engl/

CONTEXT

About the European Young Professionals' Forum (EYF)

During the one and a half days of the conference the European Young Professionals' Forum presented its work focusing on the projects of eight young professionals. They were promoted in their professional development during more than a year working together closely with a senior expert – as cooperation partner from another European country – on different topics connecting different perspectives. This "one-to-one" cooperation was the core element of the forum. But the forum has also created a unique platform which connected not only practitioners and researchers but also different types of institutions and professional fields. Universities, independent research institutes, planning networks, administrative institutions and private sector consultancies from a variety of countries met to share their expertise and knowledge in three workshops from June 2009 to June 2010.

Assistance as part of the EYF programme was offered in the form of

- individual supervision by an expert from a European research establishment or from a planning institute
- customised workshops to share experiences and provide targeted training
- financial support for a short term work experience or research project abroad for German participants; non-German participants were invited to Germany
- the opportunity to present the project results at an international conference
- assistance with publication of the project report
- various support services, such as an internet platform with specific information and options for virtual cooperation
- assistance to establish contacts within existing European networks

About the conference – Diversity of perspectives

During the conference research findings of the EYF were presented in three panels: Implementing Territorial Cohesion, Demographic Change and Climate Change. In each panel current challenges of spatial development in Europe were discussed. The panels of the conference presented a diverse range of perspectives:

- The first panel – Implementing Territorial Cohesion – included reports from Great Britain, the Netherlands and Denmark. In this panel the keynote speaker Simin Davoudi, Professor of Environmental Policy and Planning at Newcastle University, presented her views on "Why Territorial Cohesion matters".

- The second panel focused on challenges that arise through shifting demographic structures in different European regions from Germany to Austria and Slovakia. The panel was introduced by Professor Bernhard Müller, director of the Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development.

- Climate Change was the topic of the third panel where the results from studies involving Slovakia and Sweden were presented. In this panel Dr. Marco Pütz from the Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research gave an introduction with the title "Climate change adaptation by spatial planning: new challenges and old problems".

The European Young Professionals' Forum

Participants & Research topics

Young Professionals

Supervisors

Decoding cultural phenomena of Territorial Cohesion: Which policy objectives do Denmark and Germany pursue when referring to Territorial Cohesion?

Frank Othengrafen (see p. 14)

HafenCity University
Hamburg, Germany

Professor Andreas P. Cornett (see p. 29)

University of Southern Denmark
Sønderborg, Denmark

Big regions – big benefit? Strategies of Territorial Cohesion in fuzzy regions. Examples from the Øresund Region and Metropolitan Region of Hamburg

Antje Matern (see p. 20)

HafenCity University
Hamburg, Germany

Dr. Lise Herslund (see p. 39)

University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

Private enterprises and Territorial Cohesion – How does it work?

Florian Langguth (see p. 25)

SPRINTconsult
Essen, Germany

drs Gemma Smid-Marsman

Province of South-Holland
Den Haag, Netherlands

Structural results of selective migration in Europe: Focusing on the situation in Saxony-Anhalt, Germany

Andreas Schweitzer (see p. 30)

Ministry for Regional Development and Transport of the Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt
Magdeburg, Germany

Professor Mats Johansson

Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm, Sweden

Dealing with critical masses and new collectives – A new challenge in securing quality of life of the older generation in rural areas in Austria

Dr. Tatjana Fischer (see p. 33)

University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences
Vienna, Austria

Dr. Karin Wiest

Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography
Leipzig, Germany

Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and their importance for the development of regions

Jana Parízková (see p. 37)

University of Economics
Bratislava, Slovakia

Dr. Axel Stein

Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning
Erkner, Germany

Integration of mitigation into spatial policy: Comparing Leipzig and Bratislava

Christian Strauß (see p. 42)

Leipzig University
Leipzig, Germany

Professor Dr. Maroš Finka, Professor Dr. Jan Szolgay (see p. 51)

Slovak University of Technology
Bratislava, Slovakia

Climate change strategies for rural areas in selected European countries: The National Adaptation Strategies (NASs)

Asli Tepecik-Dis (see p. 46)

Nordregio – Nordic Center for Spatial Development
Stockholm, Sweden

Dr. Gerd Lintz

Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development
Dresden, Germany

Exemplary questions of the EYF-Conference



Simin Davoudi

European spatial development: Why Territorial Cohesion matters?

Since the introduction of the concept of Territorial Cohesion, two fundamental questions have preoccupied academics and policy makers: One is about its meaning; the other is about its added value.

Much has been said and written about its definition; but the one I like most is the one that appeared in the 3rd Cohesion Report, which said:
"People should not be disadvantaged by wherever they happen to live or work in the Union". I like it because it puts forward a simple yet convincing argument about the significance of place in people's welfare and the need for territorialisation of the EU policy objectives.

In order to address the question of added value, we need to address two other sub-questions: the first one is general: why and in what circumstances should governments intervene in the operation of the free markets? The second one is more specific: why and in what circumstances should policy interventions be place-based? I'll briefly elaborate on each, drawing on a recent work undertaken for the UK government.

Question 1: Why policy intervention?

A standard framework for justifying policy intervention consists of three main rationales, which are: efficiency, equity, and environmental rationale (CLG, 2007). There is a clear link between these and the EU sustainability agenda, whose three pillars are economic competitiveness, social inclusion and environmental protection.

Based on an **efficiency rationale**, policy intervention is justified if there are market failures or indeed government failures. Two classic examples of market failures are: externalities and provision of public goods. An example of government failures is the unintended consequences of existing policies. One of the holy grails of economics is to achieve what is called Pareto efficiency, named after its originator: Vilfredo Pareto, an Italian economist. It provides the underlying principle for all cost-benefit analyses which take place across public policy areas. But, it does not necessarily result in a socially desirable distribution of resources. In fact, as Amartya Sen, a noble prize winning economist, once famously suggested, "A society or economy can be Pareto optimal but still be perfectly disgusting". A market outcome where a few people or places end up very rich and the rest end up very poor might be efficient but may not be considered fair.

This brings me to the second rationale for policy intervention, which is the **equity rationale**. Intervention is justified if the market outcomes lead to uneven distribution of resources, and if these disparities are considered to be unfair. But, it is here that opinions begin to diverge, because what constitutes fairness or equitable depends on one's philosophical and political stance. Without going into details, a distinction can be made between 3 types of equality:

- Equality of opportunity whereby policy intervention should ensure that everyone has the same opportunity to fulfil their potentials and not being constrained by circumstances beyond their control (modern liberal tradition)
- Equality of outcome whereby everyone should have an equal share of resources produced by an economy or society (utilitarian tradition)
- Equality of processes whereby everybody should be treated equally and be free from discrimination (libertarian tradition)

The EU position is clear. It puts the emphasis firmly on equality of opportunity, but recognises that people may be constrained in achieving their full potential because of certain societal, institutional, and spatial barriers. This position then justifies intervention on the basis of removing such barriers to achieve better equality of outcomes.

The third rationale for policy intervention is **environmental**. Policy intervention is justified on the ground of protecting or enhancing environmental resources and objectives. While environmental rationale may be seen as part of the efficiency and equity rationales, given its significance in our wellbeing, it should be given more attention and dealt with separately and explicitly.

From an efficiency point of view, the market tends to under-value the environment; resulting in pollution, depletion of natural resources and climate change. From an equity point of view, neither access to environmental goods (such as open spaces, clean air and water) nor the distribution of environmental bads (such as pollution and waste) is universal. There are also intergenerational equity and efficiency issues. So, one may argue that short-term costs of environmental protection can be traded off against the long-term benefits of investment in natural resources, to ensure efficiency over time.

In applying this 3Es framework, it is important to emphasise that, there are often tensions and always trade-offs between efficiency, equity and environmental objectives. How these are dealt with depends largely on governments' political stance, so here again opinions begin to diverge. (for example, trickle down v. redistribution v. maximising potential)

Question 2: Why place-based policy intervention?

This is the question which is particularly relevant to the Cohesion Policy which has to justify why some policy interventions need to be place-based, rather than merely sector-based or even people-based. Put it differently, the question is: why place matters?

For many of us in this room, place matters because of our individual identity, our social relations and our cultural heritage. But, to make a case for place-based policy intervention, the justification needs to make a link to the three overarching rationales for policy intervention.

On the ground of **efficiency**, place matters because market failures and the unintended consequences of government policy impact on different places in different ways. This is because agglomeration forces that drive the distribution of economic activity interact with place-specific factors, such as geography, history, assets, accessibility; as well as path-dependent institutional legacies, and result in different socio-economic outcomes. In some places these lead to positive externalities such as attractive business environment that can boost productivity, or desirable residential environment which can attract skilled workers. In other places, however, they lead to negative externalities which undermine economic performance and people's standard of living and life chances. Hence, place is a public good in itself and plays an increasingly significant role in the globalising world of highly mobile capital and labour and diminishing natural resources.

In relation to the **equity** rationale, place matters because there are limits to people's ability to move. This is at the heart of the debate about cohesion, the question that is often asked is if the ultimate policy goal is to improve the welfare of individuals, why bother if a place is not doing well, because people can move to another place where there are better opportunities. That may be true but only if people were perfectly mobile. They are not! The financial, social and cultural costs of mobility can act as a barrier to people's ability to move and to take advantage of opportunities elsewhere. People with lower skills or those who have invested in geographically-fixed assets or those with location-specific skills are much less able to move. Some people will always be left behind. There is also the issue of untapped resources such as land (efficiency) and environmental and cultural issues which also justify why places cannot be simply abandoned.

In relation to environmental rationale, place matters because: A) the costs of environmental goods and services (such as water supply) vary in different places. This is an efficiency argument; and B) the distribution of environmental bads (such as pollution and waste) is uneven across places. This is an equity argument. For example, 10% of most deprived areas in England experience the worst air quality and 41% higher nitrogen dioxide (from industry and transport) than the average.

Sum up

Place-based or territorial policy intervention is justified if:

a. Spatial market and government failures undermine economic performance and welfare, or
b. People are disadvantaged by where they live or constrained from taking advantage of opportunities in other places, or
c. There are environmental implications of spatial disparities, and if there are equity issues in the distribution of environmental bads

So to go back to the question I raised at the beginning:
Territorial cohesion matters because place-based policy intervention is crucial if the EU aims to reduce persistent:

- economic inefficiencies
- social inequities
- environmental risks and degradations, and
- achieve "harmonious development" across Europe.

But, there remains another crucial question of governance: why is it justified for the EU to pursue a place-based cohesion policy at the European level? There are good reasons for this but my time is up.

Reference

CLG (2007): Communities and Local Government Economics Paper 1: A Framework for Intervention. London.

Professor Simin Davoudi

School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape,
Newcastle University

Simin Davoudi is Professor of Environmental Policy and Planning at the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape and the 'Justice and Governance Theme' Leader in Newcastle Institute for Research on Sustainability (NIReS), at Newcastle University. Amongst other activities she held the Presidency of the Association of the European Schools of Planning (AESOP 2004–06) and was member of the AESOP Executive Committee (2003–2007), and co-chair of the ACSP-AESOP Joint Congress Committee 2008 in Chicago, and led the UK Government's (ODPM/CLG) Planning Research Network (2003–2007) which provided advice on planning research programmes.
Her most recent books include: Conceptions of Space and Place in Strategic Spatial Planning (Routledge, 2009), and Planning for Climate Change (Earthscan, 2009). Simin has undertaken research for a wide range of international and national organisations and research funding bodies.

[http://www.ncl.ac.uk/guru/staff/profile/simin.davoudi]

PANEL 1: Territorial Cohesion

1.1 Decoding cultural phenomena of Territorial Cohesion

Which policy objectives do Denmark and Germany pursue when referring to Territorial Cohesion?

Frank Othengrafen
HafenCity University Hamburg, Germany

Frank Othengrafen used the one-year funding period to analyse the cultural aspects of Territorial Cohesion in Denmark and Germany. The respective definitions of the term "Territorial Cohesion" depend on the specific geography, the history and the planning traditions of a country. In his research studies concerning the planning strategies of these two countries Frank Othengrafen found out, that Denmark as well as Germany mainly concentrate on their competitive capability and the growth in economy. The difference is that Germany is working on a more small-scaled basis.
The cooperation with Professor Andreas P. Cornett from the University of Southern Denmark within the framework of the EYP offered Frank the possibility to conduct interviews with local stakeholders in Denmark. The common results of the cooperation between Frank Othengrafen and Andreas Cornett were presented – among other events and publications – at the 2010 congress of the European Regional Science Association (ERSA).

Achieving Territorial Cohesion is particularly important since it has, alongside the existing objectives of economic and social cohesion, become a new objective for the European Union through the Lisbon Treaty. The concept of Territorial Cohesion, which is strongly related to the European social model (Faludi 2007a: 1; David 2007: 10–11), pursues both economic competitiveness and cohesion (Waterhout 2008: 125; Ritter 2009: 105–106; CEC 2004b: 4–5). In this sense it seems to be an attempt to combine efficiency and equity in the field of territorial development by means of (1) pursuing social welfare and spatial equity, i.e. where people live should not crucially determine their opportunities nor their quality of life, (2) strengthening economic growth and competitiveness, here referring to regions and localities that each in their own way play a crucial role in growth and job creation, (3) identifying potentials to build on territorial specificities and characteristics as a base for a functional division of labour, (4) ensuring a harmonious, sustainable and balanced spatial development of the territory of the EU by introducing the principle of polycentrism, (5) ensuring fair access to infrastructure and services, and (6) refining territorial governance processes (CEC 2008a, 2008b; Faludi 2007a: 19; ARL 2008: 3–4; Waterhout 2007; Bachtler, Polveravi 2007: 125; Camagni 2007: 132; Peyrony 2007: 73).

Although Territorial Cohesion is in an early phase of policy development, it is the outcome of a political process of the last 20–30 years. The concept of Territorial Cohesion is the link between the EU's regional policy, which has been launched in 1975 and has established the goals of social and economic cohesion in the EU treaties of 1992 and 1997, and spatial development policy, starting with CEMAT meetings in 1970 and reaching its peak with the ESDP in 1999 and the Territorial Agenda in 2007 (see Fürst 2009: 174; Faludi 2007a: 5; CEC 1999). As the European Commission summarises, Territorial Cohesion 'extends beyond the notion of economic and social cohesion by both adding to this and reinforcing it' (CEC 2004a: 27). This definition is in line with Leonardi (2006: 159), who argues that 'one of the most important contributions' of the cohesion policy was the rediscovery of the territorial dimension in regional policy, i.e. 'the conceptualisation of regional policy as a territorial policy rather than a sectoral one'.



Figure 1: The profiles and comparative strengths of the cities and towns in Denmark (The Danish Ministry of the Environment 1992)

The objective of Territorial Cohesion is widely accepted among the EU institutions and the EU member states – but it becomes obvious that the member states follow different rationales and reasons when referring to Territorial Cohesion. The different rationales of Territorial Cohesion show that the term, being a 'hybrid political definition' (Mancha-Navarro, Garrido-Yserte 2008: 61; see also Ritter 2009: 105; Begg, Mayes 1993: 428), is not precisely defined yet and is frequently used and interpreted differently by the EU and its member states. This is not surprising as the implementation of Territorial Cohesion remains in the responsibility of the EU member states, each of them developing and pursuing its own proper approaches and methods which emanate from its own territorial reality and position in the European space, its history, government tradition, as well as its spatial planning and development traditions (Peyrony 2007: 73; Davoudi 2005). Against this background it is not astonishing that member states 'do not necessarily share the conceptual approach underlying Territorial Cohesion'; and that the 'policy priorities of individual countries vary greatly as do the scope and capacity of institutional arrangements within member states to address the Territorial Cohesion agenda' (Bachtler, Polveravi 2007: 126).

It can be concluded then that the concept of Territorial Cohesion is rather 'vague when it comes to breaking down Territorial Cohesion into more concrete territorial objectives' (ARL 2008: 7) – including concepts such as polycentricity, cohesion, integration, territorial impact and partnerships (Davoudi 2007: 85). Consequently, there is a 'need for a deepened understanding of Territorial Cohesion' (ARL 2008: 1; see also Camagni 2007: 130–131) to recognise how the issues of equity, competitiveness, sustainability and governance become manifested on various spatial scales and contexts (e.g. DG Regio and DG Employment 2005: 5).



Figure 2: The five Danish regions and the two metropolitan regions (Danish Ministry of the Environment 2007)

The different interpretations of Territorial Cohesion became visible when comparing spatial or regional policies in Denmark and Germany. The policy analysis includes comments of Danish and German public authorities during the consultation process of the EU Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion, national planning reports and operational programmes, as well as interviews with representatives of local and regional associations and representatives of relevant ministries.

In Denmark, Territorial Cohesion – at least in policy terms – seems to focus on strengthening economic growth and competitiveness. On the national level, a pragmatic place-based approach is emphasised, i.e. that regional territorial diversities should be regarded as regional strengths and opportunities which must be exploited. It has to be recognised in this context, that this policy – each region taking advantage of its own territorial capital – has been introduced at the national level in 1992 already (see figure 1), since then it is an important part of national spatial and structural policies.

Nevertheless, the unevenness of Danish regions calls for social solidarity and spatial justice (balanced development) on a national level. However, the claim for a balanced structure resulted in the designation of a polycentric metropolitan region on the Danish mainland, including Aarhus as the second biggest city of Denmark (see figure 2). It has been confirmed by the interviewees that this metropolitan region has been established to strengthen the competitiveness of the Danish mainland; it thus again follows the interpretation of Territorial Cohesion aiming at economic growth and competitiveness.

In Germany, Territorial Cohesion – at least in policy terms – is also interpreted in economic terms but here, the concept focuses on other spatial concepts. In Germany, metropolitan regions and functional city-regions have been introduced as new spatial category at the national level in 1995, reflecting that these areas are important for the majority of the European citizens as places

Figure 3: The Hamburg metropolitan region (Klimzug-Nord)

for living and working. By introducing the category of metropolitan regions (see also figure 3 for the Metropolitan Region of Hamburg), rural areas are connected to urban cores to pursue a (intra-regional) balanced spatial structure.

This policy approach – following the respondents' views – recognises the unevenness of the German territory and the need of social solidarity and spatial justice by developing new types of urban-rural partnerships, by fostering a new assertiveness of rural areas and by considering rural areas as economically and socially vital places. However, in contrast to the Danish discussion it is a value-laden introduction of large-scale urban-rural partnerships as a new instrument which should lead to an intra-regional balance. Some respondents also indicated that the Metropolitan Region of Hamburg should be expanded towards the Øresund region, providing a new functional meta-region where territorial diversity and assets can be better recognised than in the 'Baltic Sea cooperation area' in general.

References

Academy for Spatial Research and Planning – ARL (2008): The Territorial Cohesion Principles. Position Paper to the EU Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. = Position Paper 78. Hanover.

Bachtler, J.; Polveravi, L. (2007): Delivering Territorial Cohesion. European Cohesion Policy and the European Model of Society. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 105–128.

Begg, I.; Mayes, D. (1993): Cohesion in the European Community – A Key Imperative for the 1990s? In: Regional Science and Urban Economics (23), 427–448.

Camagni, R. (2007): Territorial Development Policies in the European Model of Society. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 129–144.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (1999): European Spatial Development Perspective – Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union. Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2004a): A new Partnership for Cohesion. Convergence, Competitiveness, Cooperation – Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2004b): Interim Territorial Cohesion Report – Preliminary results of ESPON and EU Commission studies, DG Regional Policy. Luxembourg.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2008a): Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion – Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee. Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities – CEC (2008b): Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion, the way ahead. = Inforegio Panorama (28). Luxembourg.

Danish Ministry of the Environment (1992): Denmark towards the year 2018. The 1992 national planning report for Denmark, summary and action. Copenhagen.

Danish Ministry of the Environment (2007): Spatial Planning in Denmark. Copenhagen.

David, C.-H. (2007): Status and Perspectives of Territorial Cohesion with Respect to European Spatial Development Policy (ESDP) – Normative and Governance Aspects. In: Scholich, D. (ed.): German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy 2007. Territorial Cohesion. Berlin, 5–22.

Davoudi, S. (2005): Understanding Territorial Cohesion. In: Planning Practice and Research 20 (4), 433–441.

Davoudi, S. (2007): Territorial Cohesion, the European Social Model, and Spatial Policy Research. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 81–104.

Faludi, A. (2007a): The European Model of Society. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 1–22.

Fürst, D. (2009): Regionale Strukturpolitik der EU. In: Ritter, E.-H. (2009): Europäische Raumentwicklungspolitik – Inhalte, Akteure, Verfahren, Organisation. Detmold, 159–176.

Klimzug-Nord: Metropolregion Hamburg. http://klimzug-nord.de/image.php/2009-11-11-Metropolregion-Hamburg, 2011-02-14.

Leonardi, R. (2006): Cohesion in the European Union. In: Regional Studies (40) 2, 155–166.

Mancha-Navarro, T.; Garrido-Yserte, R. (2008): Regional Policy in the European Union. The Cohesion-Competitiveness Dilemma. In: Regional Science Policy & Pracice (1)1, 47–66.

Peyrony, J. (2007): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. French Perspectives. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 61–80.

Ritter, E.-H. (2009): Europäische Raumentwicklungspolitik – Inhalte, Akteure, Verfahren, Organisation. Detmold.

Waterhout, B. (2007): Territorial Cohesion. The underlying discourses. In: Faludi, A. (ed.): Territorial Cohesion and the European Model of Society. Cambridge MA, 37–60.

Waterhout, B. (2008): The Institutionalisation of European Spatial Planning. Delft.

1.2 Big regions – big benefit? Strategies of Territorial Cohesion in fuzzy regions

Examples from the Øresund Region and Metropolitan Region of Hamburg

Antje Matern
HafenCity University Hamburg, Germany

Antje Matern worked in a close cooperation with Dr. Lise Herslund from the University of Copenhagen (Denmark) looking at different approaches of implementing Territorial Cohesion in the metropolitan regions of Hamburg and Øresund. During several mutual visits they analysed and discussed the structures of local cooperation processes in rural as well as urban areas, how they can affect Territorial Cohesion and enhance the competitive capability of a region.
Conducting interviews in Denmark Antje Matern tried to find out how different stakeholders ensure that their interests in growing networks of metropolitan regions 2.0 (MR 2.0) are considered.

New trends in Territorial Cohesion policies?

The introduction of metropolitan regions in German spatial planning politics and the reform of the Danish planning system marked a change to growth, innovation and development oriented strategies. Metropolitan regions – like the Øresund Region (ØR) or the Metropolitan Region of Hamburg (MRH) – gain a new role within the spatial system of cities and new responsibilities for spatial development. Beside development oriented tasks of fostering international competiveness, growth and innovation, a demand for a regional responsibility for Territorial Cohesion occurs. The reorientation in spatial politics gives reasons therefore as well because it may raise the risk of growing polarisation and new spatial disparities by unequal distribution of investments, productivity and employment (Keim 1998; Bürkner 2006: 545). To avoid a development of new patterns of winning and losing regions and to handle the challenge of spatial disparities on regional level a call for concepts of place-based development strategies for Territorial Cohesion was launched by the European Commission (BBR 2008; European Commission 2008: 13; Barca 2009). The main focus of place-based development strategies shall be on territorial integration through a stronger coordination of spatial policies, the support of endogenous development and networking between public and private stakeholders and the establishment of territorial (multilevel) governance on regional level (Barca 2009).

This place-based development concept seems interesting for research dealing with urban-rural disparities because it offers new strategic concepts for handling the issue. To combine economic competitiveness and Territorial Cohesion strategic concepts prioritise a development of urban-rural partnerships and new governance structures between urban and rural areas. These partnerships should combine strategies of regional development with issues of balancing disparities by building up networks and governance structures on regional level including partners from central and peripheral as well as prospering and shrinking areas – often in large scale regions and in a project oriented way (Kawka 2009; Samecki 2009).

The case of the Danish part of the Øresund Region

Both cases, the Øresund Region (which was analysed for the EYF project) and the Metropolitan Region of Hamburg (the PhD case study), are interesting cases to explore in order to find out how economic competitiveness and Territorial Cohesion could be achieved in regional coopera-

tion structures. They represent metropolitan regions 2.0 which have different specific characteristics (see fig. below) which become obvious in an analysis following the concept of relational spaces (Läpple 1992). These differences of metropolitan regions 2.0 in characteristics (e.g. in comparison to city regions) impacts the way the regional actors position themselves and their interest and thereby deal with the issue of Territorial Cohesion.

Characteristics of Metropolitan Region 2.0 (Matern 2010)



A *demand* for Territorial Cohesion results from the territorial shape of MR 2.0 as a combination of different areas – prospering and lagging, urban and rural areas which are often confronted to similar development challenges but with different concernment[1]. A main argument for the need for Territorial Cohesion on regional level are growing functional linkages and mutual dependencies of these areas caused by an ongoing enlargement of housing markets and commuting distances. This impacts selective migration processes, coordination of transportation needs, changes in the identity of former rural areas, transformation of land use etc.

Typical *tasks for urban-rural partnerships* in MR 2.0 are seen in business development and marketing. To foster growth and innovation activities include cooperative marketing for business development and international competitiveness, joint lobbying on national and international level, e.g. for infrastructure, and cluster development. Besides, the establishment of joint data bases, fostering tourism and developing quality of life, are mentioned in regional development strategies of the regions. The conceptual direction on growth and innovation oriented development is fostered by the analysis and benchmark studies, e.g. OECD studies for the Øresund Region (OECD 2003; OECD 2009), used as reference for regional strategies and mentioned by many stakeholders[2]. This discursive anchor is accompanied by project work as instrument for (short-term) implementing new ideas in regional development financed by Interreg A and Business Growth Forum in ØR (and Förderfonds in MRH). In the project work partnerships the triple helix structures[3] should be encouraged to integrate different expertise into the project development and foster the implementation of ideas.

1 These development challenges comprise the need for stimulating growth, employment and innovation to assist the structural change, handling issues of demographic change (like aging, migration or integration) and improving quality of life.
2 In the interviews it became obvious that the studies are recognised as an external expertise and its contents is rather accepted as common sense than critically reflected.
3 Triple helix structure becomes a definition for cooperation forms with actors from the public administration, universities and private businesses (like business unions, chamber of commerce etc.).

Metropolitan regions 2.0 and Territorial Cohesion?

But how can these innovation-oriented policies of the MR 2.0 fit with the tasks of Territorial Cohesion? Like Ibert (2009: 23) mentioned *Innovation and Cohesion* seem to be opposite concepts[4]. First, innovation oriented policies are characterised by open frameworks with unclear objectives. They focus on networking and the linkage of partners from different sectoral, organizational and hierarchical background and project work as implementation instrument (Ibert 2009). Cohesion oriented networks spotlight predictable and transparent decision making modes, a mutual understanding of tasks, norms and expectations and options for participation for members (Schimank 2002).

Second, it seems that MR 2.0 offer a kind of spaceless cohesion policy because it concentrates on functional linkages and networks rather than the territorial oriented cooperation. The establishment of metropolitan regions creates new actors which are not necessarily linked to territorial logic of acting. Trans-border organizations[5] are established for the cooperation process and become driving forces. The typical actors regarding territorial issues – politicians, spatial planners and other members of public administration – are only one of the stakeholders in the projects. Therefore it seems interesting to focus on stakeholders acting and to elaborate their awareness of spatial issues and impacts of acting on spaces to contribute how meaningful the concerns about separating development path of regions in times of functional cooperation are.

Thereby the orientation of MR 2.0 on growth and innovation and their structures are at the same time challenge and opportunity for regional development regarding Territorial Cohesion. It is an *opportunity* because it supports endogenous activities, networking and self-responsible acting in regional development (enabling people for endogenous development) by its characteristic of project orientation, combination of new partners and building networks.

But it could be a *challenge* as well because actors face different preconditions and could not use the space of opportunity in the same extent. Mutual functional relations and networks are quite selective and not all of the areas are involved in the developments. Although the urban-rural partnerships follow the principle of cooperation between equal partners, preconditions are different regarding the stakeholder's territorial and thematic background. So it seems important to focus on structural and individual constraints which limit individual actors and their motivations to use the cooperation for their interests and to consider territorial impacts.

What's the benefit from the periphery point of view?

In the case study analysis a perspective from the periphery is chosen because it seems meaningful for Territorial Cohesion how those – often less powerful – stakeholder position themselves and their interests in this cooperation. The following theses could be a starting point of further elaboration:

- Actors from rural peripheral areas are often confronted with limited personal and financial resources. The number and skills of actors restricts the number of preparatory work, participation in projects and meetings – especially because the investments of travelling costs are higher in peripheral areas than in central one. Thereby the number and variety of platforms, networks and projects under the umbrella of MR 2.0 can become a problem for actors with limited resources in terms of participation but also to keep an overview about what's going on.
- Topics and issues of MR 2.0 often address some interesting (additional) development issues not the major challenges of peripheral areas. One reason can be the agenda setting of projects and working groups in MR 2.0 which is often dominated by other, more powerful actors like the major city with different interests. Another reason is that a lot of challenges and duties are more local in its characteristic and the metropolitan level wouldn't be the

4 Networks with a high level of cohesion tend to be less innovative because they avoid confronting their members with unexpected ideas and interpretations.
5 Such new organizations are e.g. Øresund Committee, Øresund Science Region, Interreg Secretariat, Øresund Direct for ØR and Rat der Wirtschaftsförderer, Arbeitsgruppen, project groups, Lenkungsausschuss etc. for MRH.

appropriate one to solve them. This leads back to the issue of resources and priorities and directs to a more selective engagement of stakeholders from peripheral areas in the cooperation.

- The organizational characteristic of the informal, trans-border, trans-sectoral and public-private network organizations seem to prefer powerful partners because they are depending on the contribution of those powerful ones in their agenda setting and project work. "We need at least 5 powerful partners to run a project" one of the interview partners mentioned. Interest organizations or strong networks of rural actors could be a way to deal with the importance of size and influence.
- But the MR 2.0 could offer a bunch of benefits for the peripheral actors. This can include political clout and visibility and the image of embeddedness in larger contexts. It opens access to information, networks and other stakeholders as well as extra funding and service units with additional financial, personal and regulative power. On normative level a consideration of specific needs and commitment to urban-rural partnerships as a rule for cooperation could be taped.
- The benefits of MR 2.0 for rural stakeholders depend very much on the strategies addressed. Regarding the two cases stakeholders from peripheral areas use the free ride option more often instead of taking the lead in project work. This strategy offers the participation in sectoral studies and analysis (like economic analysis of business sides), in marketing activities (fairs or campaigns) as well as keeping the actors informed about knowledge, forthcoming issues or project ideas without the need for big engagement. A more intensive engagement would be necessary to foster a greater intersection of themes and demands. This can be fostered by another agenda setting or the development of efficient pre-decision making structures.

What does this mean for Territorial Cohesion?

At the glance, the new understanding of a more place-based Territorial Cohesion follows the old model of cities as growth motors. The metropolitan regions as places of concentrations of economic, societal and demographic development should spread positive effects to their hinterlands and thereby the Territorial Cohesion focuses on the integration motor "city". Strategies to foster growth in participating regions spotlight the importance of networks, endogenous development and symbolic integration by joint branding and place making. It refers to the role of growth, innovation and cluster development as well as the role of images and symbols in the competition of regions for awareness.

Metropolitan regions like the Metropolitan Region of Hamburg and the Øresund region fulfil a bunch of criteria for a place-based cohesion strategy. Main criteria or framework settings are in line with the requirements for territorial compensation, territorial integration and territorial governance. They foster regional development by promotion job generation and offer symbolic integration of different actors, interests and regions under the umbrella of the new spaces.

- The normative orientation on growth, innovation and development of metropolitan regions matches with the cohesion approach to foster endogenous development by using endogenous potentials and strengths and by widening policy options in using complementary structures. Synergies can be used by connecting urban and rural areas or by the linkage of heterogeneous spatial structures.
- Especially in the case of the ØR the liberalization of planning tasks on national level establishes regional cooperation and consensus-building as major decision making mode. Every planning task needs to be negotiated along relevant actors. It might support place making, the building of networks between regional actors and develop new territorial governance structures (but can also force stalemate situations and negative coalition building). Besides the triple helix structure of the business growth forum offers an option for an intensive exchange between urban planning and regional development which is often claimed.
- The recent organizations (of the steering group, working and project groups) offer structures for vertical and horizontal coordination of spatially relevant policies and for a coherent implementation of territorial relevant competencies. It fosters information, communication and negotiation of potential conflicts in an early stage. But still it is an informal decision making process and can be blocked by unilateral acting.

MR 2.0 represent a new form of governance on meta-regional level and a rescaling of regional cooperation. But there is a need for further analysis of stakeholder's perspectives on Territorial Cohesion in these regions to contribute to the question to what extent these regions can supply the national cohesion policy or the structural policy which still is the main instrument for balancing disparities in Europe.

References

Barca, F. (2009): An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. A place-based approach to meeting European Union Challenges and Expectations. http://www.eurada.org/site/files/Regional%20development/Barca_report.pdf, 09.02.2011.

BBR – Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (2008) (Hrsg.): Europäische Politik des territorialen Zusammenhalts. Bonn.

Bürkner, H.-J. (2004): Polarisierung und Peripherisierung. Schrumpfende Städte. In: Oswald, P. (Hrsg.): Schrumpfende Städte. Band 1: Internationale Untersuchung. Ostfildern, 546–551.

European Commission (2008): Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. Turning territorial diversity into strength; communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee. Luxemburg.

Ibert, O. (2009): Innovationsorientierte Planung und das Problem des episodischen Lernens. = Arbeitsmaterial der ARL 348. Hannover.

Kawka, R. (2009): Growth and Innovation through Urban-Rural-Partnership. In: Strubelt, W. (Hrsg.): German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy 2008. Guiding Principles for Spatial Development in Germany. Berlin, Heidelberg, 57–73.

Keim, K. (1998): Sozial-räumliche Milieus in der zweiten Moderne. In: Matthiesen, U. (Hrsg.): Die Räume der Milieus. Neue Tendenzen in der sozial- und raumwissenschaftlichen Milieuforschung in der Stadt- und Raumplanung. Berlin, 83–97.

Läpple, D. (1992): Essay über den Raum. In: Häußermann, H.; Siebel, W. (Hrsg.): Stadt und Raum. Soziologische Analysen. Pfaffenweiler, 158–207.

OECD (2003): Öresund, Denmark/Sweden. In: OECD Territorial Reviews.

OECD (2009): Copenhagen, Denmark: In: OECD Territorial Reviews.

Samecki, P. (2009): Orientation Paper on Future Cohesion Policy. http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/newsroom/pdf/pawel_samecki_orientation_paper.pdf, 09.02.2011.

Schimank, U. (2002): Organisationen: Akteurskonstellationen, korporative Akteure, Sozialsysteme. In: Hinz, Th.; Allmendinger, J. (Hrsg.): Organisationssoziologie. = Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie Sonderheft 42. Wiesbaden, 29–54.

1.3 Private enterprises and Territorial Cohesion: How does it work?

Florian Langguth
SPRINT – research, evaluation, implementation, Essen, Germany

Florian Langguth focused on the participation of private enterprises in regional development. Supported by Drs. Gemma Smid-Marsmann from the Province of South-Holland he conducted a case study in the region Goeree-Overflakee. Encouraged by the funding of the EYF Florian Langguth attended a language course to refresh his Dutch skills for interviews with the local entrepreneurs. He identified a big potential for improving Territorial Cohesion in the know-how, the financial resources and the knowledge of private enterprises. As a practitioner working in policy consulting he published his results in a trilingual brochure – in Dutch, English and German.

Main Objective and Research Questions

The main objective of the project was primarily to show the interdependencies between the participation of enterprises in integrated regional development processes and the concept of Territorial Cohesion, and secondly, to examine a concrete case of participation of enterprises. The results of the project shall contribute to supporting the participation of enterprises in the process of regional development and hence, contribute to the Territorial Cohesion of European regions.

Where is the linkage between the participation of private enterprises in integrated development processes and the concept of Territorial Cohesion?

Since the 1990s Territorial Cohesion has been an essential part of the European and national discussion, especially within the Spatial Development Policy. The establishment of the objective 'Territorial Cohesion' in the Reform Treaty of Lisbon peps up the discussion about achieving Territorial Cohesion. The aim of Territorial Cohesion is to ensure the harmonious development of all places within the EU.

The discussion about how Territorial Cohesion can be reached is characterised by manifold opinions and positions. Despite these different views, certain basic elements of such politics have evolved and been consolidated. Those elements are e.g. the strengthened coherence of European politics, transnational cooperation and the call for place-based approaches, such as a stronger exploitation and valorisation of the existing potentials of regional development ('territorial capital'). For this valorisation, integrated regional strategies are essential, which are developed jointly by different regional actors (stakeholders), because these regional actors can deliver special knowledge about their region and play a central role to valorisation of these potentials.

The project is based on the hypothesis, that even though the locally and regionally based entrepreneurship captures a central position in these regional governance processes, they are often not involved in such processes. The problem is that without their participation especially the 'economic part' for the process is missing and therefore, some of the main goals like job creation or investments into the region cannot be achieved to the full extent.

How does participation of private enterprises in integrated regional development processes work? Which problems can be expected and how can they be solved? – A Case Study

Concerning the above stated hypothesis, the question rises of how the participation of enterprises can be organised and implemented. To answer these questions a case study in the Netherlands was carried out within the project. The main investigation focus was the preparation of an integrated regional 'Structure Vision' for the Goeree-Overflakkee Region (further information on the instrument of 'Structure Vision' and on the region is given in the boxes).

In the Netherlands, the conception phase of an integrated regional 'Structure Vision' and especially the way of participating stakeholders lies in the responsibility of the local and regional public authorities. In the case of the Goeree-Overflakkee the conception phase was divided into three phases (see overview).

Overview: Process of Preparation

	First Phase	Second Phase	Third Phase
Working Steps	local visions and sector-related studies	Development of perspectives for regional development in several fields, as base for a broad discussion	Import of results out of the "Future Debates"
Results	"Koersnotitie"	"Notitie Ontwikkelings-perspectiven"	Draft Version "Integrale regionale Structuurvisie"
Participation	Interviews, workshops, presentations	2 "Future Debates"	Public consultation

During the first phase various local visions were produced and case studies regarding different sectors of regional development were conducted. For example, a 'Structure Vision' for each of the four municipalities on the island was developed, complemented by studies about the economic development of the region or special sectors, as recreation and tourism. The visions and studies were evaluated and the main results and elements were concluded in a so called *Koersnotitie*. The outcome (the concept) was rated as status quo, covering all aspects regarding regional development. The participation of the stakeholders was created differently regarding the certain visions or studies. Depending on the content of the vision or study, participation took place in form of single interviews, workshops or subsuming presentations.

During the second phase different perspectives on regional development of the isle, based on the results of the first phase, were collected and subsumed in the *Notitie Ontwikkelingsperspectiven*. These perspectives built the base for a broad discussion process, which was conducted by all relevant people in the region in form of two so called 'Future Debates'.

During the third phase a draft version of the 'Structure Vision' for the region was created, based on the results of the "Future Debates" and of the beforehand conducted working steps. This draft version was displayed for public in April 2010. At this date the working step 'collection of data and information' has already been finished. Hence, the results and outcomes mentioned are based on the first and second phase of the preparation of a 'Structure Vision'.

Methodology

The case study compasses an analysis of documents and literature, qualitative interviews as well as a study trip to the region. Interviews were conducted with a representative of the *Intergemeentelijk Samenwerkingsverband Goeree-Overflakkee (ISGO)* – an intermunicipal association, which is amongst others responsible for the integrated development of the region – , and a representative of the municipality as well as a consultant, who accompanied the process and was involved as supporter during the preparation of the single working steps. Unfortunately, ent-

Region Goeree-Overflakkee

The Goere-Overflakke region consists of an isle in the southern part of the Province of South-Holland, with a size of 261 km². It consists of the four municipalities Oostflakkee, Dirksland, Middelharnis and Goedereede. The isle has 48.000 inhabitants (in 2006). Contrary to the mainly urbanised province the island is a rural area. Its qualities lie in its central position, its diverse economic infrastructure (especially agriculture, fishery, recreation and tourism and the care sector), the supply of commercial areas, the working population, and the quality of living, which is characterised by the quietness, wide landscapes and the vicinity to the coast (BCI, NovioConsult 2007: 1 f.).

Integrated Regional Structure Vision

The Dutch planning system is currently in a stage of change. The Dutch planning law, in force since 1965, is to be displaced by the new version of the *Wet op de ruimtelijke ordening (Wro)*. The reasons were the complexity based on countless accommodations and changes, and a needless long process of decision-making.
With the new law the responsibilities have been divided in three levels; the national, the state and the municipality. Processes and decision-making have been simplified and shortened and additionally, new instruments have been adopted. One of these new instruments is the integrated 'Structure Vision'.
All of the three planning levels, the national level, the state and the municipality, have to set up a structure vision of their territory. The structure vision is a strategic concept, which includes the aims and the concerns of the policy related to the development of their area as well as information on how these aims and concerns can be achieved. Thus, it is the base for further plans or regulations.
The municipalities have the right to set up a common structure vision if it does make sense.

repreneurs of the region could not be enlisted for interviews. Thus, an interview was carried out with the, for the region responsible, counsellor of the *Kamer of Koophandel* – an organization, which represents the interests of enterprises in the Netherlands.

Results – Following results can be drawn from the case study:

- All interview partners, the private as well as the public actors, are convinced that a participation of enterprises is important, generally and specifically during the conception phase of an integrated regional 'Structure Vision'. Due to the participation, enterprises have the opportunity to bring in their interests and needs into the preparation process. But not only the enterprises, but also the other stakeholders, which organised the process and decide over the vision, can profit by the participation – for example, in gaining tacit knowledge from the enterprises.
- The possibilities of participation are rated differently. The representatives of the municipalities rate the participation as appropriate, whereas the counsellor of the *Kamer of Koophandel* reflects, that more possibilities and efforts can be given. Lastly, it is always a question of finance and time, in which extend a participation can be created, stated the consultant.
- The problems with participation of enterprises were assumed to be due to primarily, lacking time availability, especially in the case of smallest and small enterprises, and secondly, due to the missing link between the issues worked on in the vision and the special problems of the enterprises.

- The experiences of all interviewees concerning participation of enterprises show the following results: Firstly, the problem linkage plays an important role for participation. For example, it is easier to capture a local enterprise, instead of a regional, because a lot of problems take place on a local level. Secondly, interest groups of enterprises and renowned local players are of great importance. They function as multiplicator and information transfer and therefore, built the link to and between the other entrepreneurs in the region.

Recommendations

Following recommendations can be concluded of the case study Goeree-Overflakkee:

- **Talk to them:** It is essential to build up closeness to the problem of private enterprises from the beginning on. This requires a dialogue with the enterprises to define their interests and needs.
- **Work with them:** Enterprises have important knowledge, which is crucial for the process. Hence, it is essential to include the enterprises to profit from their knowledge. But: participation of enterprises does not mean to include every enterprise in the region, but to identify the engaged and interested ones to include them into the process of preparation of strategies.
- **Support them:** A participation of stakeholders does not occur because of altruistic reasons. This applies as well to enterprises as to e.g. associations. Therefore, something must be offered to them, which refers to their needs and interests. A direct benefit has to be obtained out of the participation.
- **Sensitise them:** Integrated does not only mean economically. But enterprises must learn to recognise that a sustainable development of the region needs holistic approaches, which account for all dimensions and sectors and not only their own concrete problems.

Reference

BCI; NovioConsult – Buck Consultants International; NovioConsult Van Spaendonck (2007): Eigen wijze groei – Regional-economische visie Goeree-Overflakkee 2007–2020. Nijmegen.

Professor Andreas P. Cornett – University of Southern Denmark, Sønderborg

Interdisciplinary partnerships: An inspiration

During the programme period of the EYF three workgroup seminars took place in Leipzig, Dresden and Erkner/Berlin. All three had a distinct content aiming to develop the relationship between tutors and the young professionals based on a specific cooperation project, developed with point of departure in the applicant's original exposé outlined in the application for participation in the programme. Furthermore the seminars served as network building facility for all participants, tutors as well as young professionals. The career development unit included in the Dresden seminar stressed the common challenges people meet at an early stage of their career, regardless whether they are in universities, research institutes or civil service.

The individual project – of course – became the centre of interest in the last seminars, reflecting the progress of the programme itself. All of us soon noticed that a one year project period is a short time for a cooperative international partnership project due to the very different academic calendars in the participating countries. But overall the seminar set-up contributed to a progressive and fruitful development of the network at large and the projects involved.

Personally, I was the tutor for Frank Othengrafen from the HafenCity University in Hamburg. The tutorial relationship was truly interdisciplinary which itself is enriching for both partners, and actually resulted in a joint paper for the 50th Congress of the European Regional Science Association entitled 'The Spatial policy and planning in Northern Europe: An assessment of recent trends in policy and economic development', and we are still working on a final version for publication. For Frank Othengrafen the network served as a framework for interviewing key actors in regional planning and economic development agencies in the 3 countries.

Overall my impression of the European Young Professionals' Forum is that the mixture between organised activities and flexibility in the tutor/young professional relationship was a key factor for the successful implementation. From a tutor's perspective the interdisciplinary partnership of the tutor/young professional was the most inspirational aspect.

Hamburg-Denmark Connection during the workshop in Berlin, June 2010 (left to right): Antje Matern, Lise Herslund, Frank Othengrafen, Andreas P. Cornett

PANEL 2: Demographic Change

2.1 Structural results of selective migration in Europe

Focusing on the situation in Saxony-Anhalt, Germany

Andreas Schweitzer
Ministry of Regional Development and Transport of the Federal State Saxony-Anhalt, Magdeburg, Germany

Andreas Schweitzer dealt with questions of selective migration in Saxony-Anhalt especially of young women. Looking for employment a lot of well educated women between the age of 20 and 25 leave their homes while men stay in their region. This mismatch between young women and men could lead to social changes in some of these regions.
During a research internship in Sweden Andreas had the possibility to compare the situations of the two countries. Within the EYF he was supported by Professor Mats Johansson of the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm. As an employee in the ministry he is going to keep working on this topic in a project within the framework of the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON).

Nearly everywhere in Europe, girls and young women have better educational qualifications than their male counterparts. This means that women in the younger age group have more options when it comes to out-migration from structurally weak regions. The result is that many regions are faced with a shortage of young, better educated women. While the remaining men are often low skilled and unemployed. From a European perspective this is especially observed in rural or sparsely populated areas and in territories which are considered to belong to the internal or external peripheries of the European Union. This mismatch between young women and men could lead to social changes in some of these regions. With regard to Territorial Cohesion in Europe this text focuses on the situation of the Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt.



Fig. 1: Population Saxony-Anhalt from 31.12.1990 to 31.12.2009, Statistics Office of Saxony-Anhalt

Saxony-Anhalt is a Federal State in Eastern-Germany. The cities of Halle (population of 231.874 as of 07/2010) and Magdeburg (population of 230.446 as of 07/2010), the state capital, are the largest cities. Even though it is located in the middle of Europe, the region does not belong to the economic core areas of Germany. On the contrary it has been facing serious economic transitions and demographic challenges. Like the other Eastern Federal States, Saxony-Anhalt is strongly affected by the out-migration of young people and a negative natural development which leads to a rapidly ageing population. Recently Saxony-Anhalt belongs to those regions in Europe with the strongest loss of population. From 1990 to 2009 there was an overall population decline of nearly -518.000 people (18%, see fig. 1). It is interesting that the women's decline (-300.000, 20%) is much higher than the men's (-216.000, 16%). Impressively the gender-related migration balance identifies this mismatch: From 1990 to 2009 the migration balance of men was -100.000 while at the same time Saxony-Anhalt lost nearly -145.000 women.



Fig. 2: Out-Migration from Saxony-Anhalt in 2007, Statistics Office of Saxony-Anhalt

Internal migration affects the demographic, economic and social development of a region. In Germany the large-scale east-west migration is dominant and not really a new phenomenon, e.g. in the educational field. But it will lead to serious social and economic consequences, when the out-migrants do not return. An explanation of large-scale migration and its age-selectivity is the concept of life cycle. These migration flows are therefore more likely triggered by the personal vita and can respond to disparate living conditions, e.g. labour market or infrastructure. Migration occurs if a higher satisfaction level is to be expected in the new region. Crucial is the interplay between subjective decisions and endogenous factors.

Reasons for the higher migration of young women are – among others – their higher education but lack of employment opportunities in East Germany. Obviously they have a greater willingness to move than their male counterparts. Moreover, they move away from home much earlier (fig. 2), and finally, also the mismatch on the marriage market is an important factor.

The effects of gender-related brain drain are severe. With regard to the demographic consequences the out-migration of young women implies the loss of future mothers and children. Result is a surplus of men, particularly in younger cohorts, in the peripheral rural areas and economically weak regions.

Considering the migration loss by age, the group of 15 to 24-year-olds denotes the biggest losses. With a share of about 45 per cent of total net-migration young and well qualified people are lost.



Fig. 3: Development of age-group fertility in Saxony-Anhalt (ASFR), Statistics Office of Saxony-Anhalt

This affects also the natural population development: To ensure the natural reproduction, a statistical value of 2.1 children per woman is required. Since 1990 this value was not reached in Saxony-Anhalt. This figure fell in the early 1990s, even under one and then increased since 1997 again continuously up to 1.3 in 2007. Despite the steady loss of women in the childbearing age, in recent years a stabilisation of births has been achieved. Nowadays, Saxony-Anhalt approaches the average value of the Federal Republic of Germany – about 1.4 children per woman.

Figure 3 shows the age specific fertility rate (ASFR) for Saxony-Anhalt in 1990 and 2008. It is clearly evident that fewer children are born at a later time during the life span of women. Against this background a strategic approach for the state government is therefore, to enlarge family-friendly activities in Saxony-Anhalt. The attractiveness of cities through urban renewal, the revitalisation of the inner cities and the creation of family-friendly infrastructure are part of it. Future strategies must deal with the improvement of the living conditions of the remaining population to enable young people to stay or return. Therefore target-oriented regional development strategies should be established.

2.2 Dealing with critical masses and new collectives

A new challenge in securing quality of life of the older generation in rural areas in Austria

Dr. Tatjana Fischer
University of Agriculture and Applied Life Science,
Vienna, Austria

Tatjana Fischer analysed the possibilities of securing the quality of life for senior citizens living in rural areas of Austria. Specifically she had a closer look at the resulting consequences on spatial planning which, in the future, should reassess the structures of existing settlements. Though the question remains on which scale the most effective solutions can be found – especially if the people in charge ignore the consequences of demographic change.
As a participant of the EYF and with the help of Dr. Karin Wiest (Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography, Leipzig) Tatjana Fischer was able to broaden her professional network in Germany.

In times of (demographic) change and (financial) crises the conditions of sustainable spatial planning – especially for structural weak rural areas – have to be reconsidered. Decision-makers in rural planning more than ever have to take into account the interrelations of spatial structures, spatial perception and spatial behaviour of an increasing variety of demander groups. Focussing on the group of people aged 60+ this contribution wants to emphasise the necessity to look precisely at the profile, attitudes and behaviour of the demanders in order to be able to offer adequate spatial solutions and to identify rooms of manoeuvre. Besides overall statistical information relating to demographic issues little information is being provided relating to socio-gerontological and psychological aspects that strongly have spatial implications. That is why spatial development already rather operates more with assumptions than with facts.

The doctoral thesis "Ageing in rural areas – a spatial analysis" (see Fischer, 2005) finds that in the future spatial planning more and more will face a new challenge relating securing quality of life of the older generation in rural areas in Austria: dealing with critical masses – defined as a group of persons spatial planning particularly has to care for – and new collectives – defined as amounts of demanders – among the 60+ in order to be able to fit demand and supply better. A series of lectures on the future of ageing in rural areas of the Austrian federal state Burgenland (see Fischer, 2009) confirms or rather strengthens the results of the doctoral thesis.

At the beginning of the discussion about securing or rather improving "quality of life" it is necessary to distinguish between "needs and desires" on the one hand and different points of view on the other hand. Without doubt the crucial desire of the older generation is to be able to live a self-determined life in one's own four walls as long as possible. The opportunities and obstacles of gaining this are being discussed differently in policy and administration ("from outside") as well as among those who already are concerned (e. g. older people in need of help and care, care-givers). Furthermore, measuring quality of life in order to understand and explain the gap between desire and reality is very difficult because of the individual composition of "subjective" (e. g. well-being, contentment, security) and "objective" (e. g. basic supply with goods and services, social-medical care, availability and quality of social networks) aspects of quality of life.

Because of this, analysing "quality of life" taking into account interrelations to spatial aspects always is a matter of framing. Besides the "outer change" of the quality of the residential area relating to general conditions (trends) like socio-demographic change, concentration and centralization tendencies, it can be found that spatial structures more and more adjust to auto-mobility that implies, for example, the decline of local supply facilities or selective outer-migration. The old themselves who are not auto-mobile are left. The "inner change" related to social cohesion bases on the transformation of traditional "rural communities". Today the heterogeneity of profiles of (local) population and multi-local residence (comprising the group of young people as well) has become standard and can even be found in remote structural weak rural areas. Increasing auto-mobility and opportunities of individual fulfilment cause out-migration, an increasing loss of spatial and social proximity (volunteering vs. institutionalisation) as well as collective ageing of whole settlements.

Looking at the profile of today's older generation one can find several characteristic common traits as well as diversity (e. g. life-styles). Most of the important similarities are: the crucial need of being able to live in one's own four walls as long as possible, the repression of subjects relating to "being old" and "ageing", mismatch of quantity of (daily) supply and subjective perceived quality of life, structuring the day ("duties in the morning", "spare time in the afternoon"), in case of given auto-mobility: importance of car-availability; boundedness to place and settledness, different ways of compensating the lack of spatial and social proximity.

Diversity within the group of people aged 60+ relates to desires, biographies (e. g. former employment, migration background), needlessness, tolerance, existential worries, relevance of tradition, availability and quality of social networks, expression of demands and acceptance of help importance of freedom of choice (goods and services), organisation of everyday life, access and use of information, degree of auto-mobility (men vs. women; very old persons vs. best-aged seniors), individual spatial behaviour and patterns of provision and leisure activities, sensitiveness relating to perception of spatial changes.

Because of this, urban value-systems more and more penetrate even structural weak peripheral rural areas which influences the quality of village communities and implies the emergence of new demander groups so-called "new collectives" and "critical masses" among the old. That is why approaches towards characterization and classification of people aged 60+ have to be changed.

In the past, successful characterizing of the old based on "activities/attitudes/opinions": Four groups of older people could be identified that way: "active new seniors", "seniors focussed on security and community", "conscientious-domestic seniors" and "resigned seniors" (see Amt der Oberösterreichischen Landesregierung, 2000). Another approach focuses on "experiences/demands" and distinguishes the following groups: former commuters, former secondary dwellers, former farmers, non-employed persons, highly aged people (men vs. women) and immigrants (different migration backgrounds).

At present, applied spatial sciences concentrate on "lifestyles/circumstances of life" and define the following groups of (future) demanders among the old: healthy, auto-mobile persons with middle or high income at their disposal; persons who can rely on stable available social (family) support (networks); people who always have concentrated themselves on their partnership and who have never looked for other kinds of social networks; seniors who live alone (with different amounts of income at their disposal) as well as "new emerging groups" like care-givers, old people who struggle with diseases and immobility and who have to rely on external help; and persons with small income.

As a consequence sustainable spatial planning and rural development have to pay attention to the rising relevance of selected socio-gerontological and psychological aspects (e. g. rejuvenation of age, plurality of lifestyles, increasing individuality, decreasing settledness?), the emergence of the new crucial desire "being auto-mobile as long as possible", the necessity of dealing with "diversity" in order to be able to identify the demander groups for goods and services of tomorrow particularly considering issues of identification, re-integration, attractions and bindings to urban areas.

One of the challenges for spatial planning is to fit types of rural areas with new knowledge about today's and tomorrow's collectives and critical masses among the 60+. Figure 1 gives an overview of the "composition" of today's older generation and scenarios of what can be expected in the near future in two selected types of rural areas in Austria.

The past and future older generation in selected structurally weak and strong rural areas.

types of rural areas	"collectives" – today	"critical masses" – today	"collectives" – tomorrow	"critical masses" – tomorrow
structurally weak rural areas	former farmers people with small income active seniors	care-givers with small income unpaired	unpaired elderly in need of help and care	reclusive, un-integrated old people people focussed on partnership elderly people with small income and without any support from social networks
(partly) structurally strong suburban areas	active seniors of high mobility (e. g. former commuters, secondary dwellers) very old locals	(very) old people and elderly people with small income (still employed) care-givers	(still employed) care-givers	seniors who recently have lost their auto-mobility and forced to reorganise their everyday life seniors with small income

(Fischer 2010)

Designing sustainable spatial solutions, especially for peripheral alpine areas already concerned of ageing, is a challenging thing. At the background of decreasing public and private financial rooms of manoeuvre "looking precisely" is one of the most urgent and necessary condition for successful allocation of money. From today's point of view it can be expected that the "new collectives" in remote rural areas probably will be immobile people of small income or rather without any support from social networks on the one hand and healthy auto-mobile seniors with middle or high income at the other hand. In this structural type of rural areas "new collective" and "critical mass" will be the same.

Up to now, two crucial questions are being left open:
1. Who decides for ageing in which type of rural area?
2. What about dealing with the very different circumstances of ageing and opportunities for a high-quality ageing even in peripheral structural weak rural areas?

The mismatch of demands (esp. based on the increasing diversity of desires) and actual opportunities can be explained by the interrelation of lifestyles, quality of life and (daily) supply. Five essential conclusions can be drawn:

Conclusion 1: Auto-mobile seniors do not perceive spatial (infrastructural) deficiencies.

Conclusion 2: For best-aged seniors today subjective quality of life means auto-mobility and social networks – spatially scattered very often.

Conclusion 3: Three thresholds of losses of quality of life can be identified: Firstly, the loss of one's auto-mobility; secondly, one's transition from "the need of help" to "the need of care"; thirdly, there will be a shorter duration of immobility, but individual perception will be more intensive.

Conclusion 4: Spatial challenges do not diminish despite increasing auto-mobility (of the older generation), they shift to those groups of people who (are able and willing to) care for those who have already become immobile.

Conclusion 5: Priorities of action depend on the structural strength and demographic development of rural areas and means securing basic supply of goods and services in structurally weak rural areas on the one hand and enlarging the offers and supply in structurally strong rural areas on the other hand.

References

Amt der Oberösterreichischen Landesregierung (2000): Oberösterreicherinnen aus dem Blickwinkel der Statistik. Eine Information des Statistischen Dienstes des Amt der Oberösterreichischen. Landesregierung 9. Linz.

Fischer, T. (2009): Welche Zukunft hat das Altwerden am Land? Vortragsreihe im Rahmen der umfassenden Dorferneuerung im Burgenland: 23.1.2009, Rohr im Burgenland; 5.2.2009, Eberau; 18.2.2009, Burgauberg-Neudauberg.

Fischer, T. (2005): Aging in rural areas – a spatial analysis. Doctoral thesis. University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences. Vienna.

2.3 Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and their importance for the development of regions

Jana Parízková
University of Economics, Bratislava, Slovakia

Jana Parízková dealt with the significance of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in regional development. Since 1989 numerous IT-companies started their business in the larger cities of Slovakia and provide new jobs in technology based sectors. It is very important to integrate schools and educational development in this process. The use of ICT by Slovakian teachers in their daily work increases constantly thus preparing their students for future technologies and jobs.
This is also the topic of her PhD-thesis, which she finished by the end of 2010. During the one-year funding period of the EYF, Jana was supported by Dr. Axel Stein from the Leibniz Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning in Erkner.

Information and Communication Technologies have an undeniable impact on the economies of countries, on their regions as well as the inhabitants themselves. The nature of ICT allows to overcome territorial peripherality. ICT help to disseminate valuable information and improve the efficiency of governments. ICT also enhance the provision of education and health and increase access to the latest up-to-date knowledge. Through ICT networked territories can achieve information and knowledge, despite their location and their physical accessibility. ICT may increase attractive-ness of regions as a strategic location factor, which positively impacts on the economic growth of the area and enhances territorial competitiveness. According to the OECD, ICT are responsible for 25 per cent of GDP growth and 50 per cent of productivity growth. The aim of the research was to study impacts and contribution of Information and Communication Technologies in Slovakia, especially in job creating, education and government.

From 1989 Slovak companies dealing with Information and Communication Technologies have been established by well-educated and well-informed graduates or researchers who had access to foreign literature or managers working in computing centres in big Slovak state companies. Big international companies started to establish their branch offices in Slovakia at first with the aim to sell and supply their goods and provide services. After creating a hospitable environment, the second phase of investments started – to operate their service centres (T-Systems, Soitron, Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Dell, Accenture). The third stage of expansion of ICT companies is to provide research activities, software development and programming (NESS Slovakia, part of Siemens).

Especially the regions of Bratislava and Košice are interesting investment destinations for the ICT sector with more than 6,200 jobs created. For large companies of the IT sector it does not make sense to locate their IT centres in inaccessible valleys with huge unemployment, where the firms do not receive the necessary connectivity. For example, Accenture supports the mobility of the workforce, trying to recruit workers from other regions of Slovakia and help them to come to Bratislava. Apart from this, companies in the IT sector localise in regions with high-qualified labour and universities with IT specializations. Therefore they choose Bratislava or Košice for their branch offices.

University students can get qualification in the field of ICT in Bratislava, Košice and Žilina. The number of students studying in the field of Information and Communication Technologies since 1990 shows an upward trend. In Bratislava, the number of university students rose from 671

in 1990 to 3,460 in 2004. After then the number of students has risen only slightly to 4,054 in 2009. In Košice, nowadays, 1,392 students study in the ICT field and in Žilina 925 students. The number of doctoral students has also increased. In 1999 140 students studied in Bratislava, in 2009 there were 216 students. In Košice we currently register 70 doctoral students and in Žilina 35 doctoral students in the ICT field.

Teaching of ICT and using ICT in education is essential to implement in primary and secondary schools. Big companies as Microsoft realise how important it is. That is why they created special programmes to support schools in implementing and using ICT. Schools have a particular problem with financing it.

According to the European-wide survey in EU27 in every country more than 90 % of all schools have internet access. Using ICT in classrooms radically increased from 28 % of schools in 2001 to 68 % of schools in 2006 as an average. In the United Kingdom 95 % of schools provided computers in classrooms in 2006, in the Netherlands 92 %, in Slovenia 93 %, while in Greece only 18 % and in Slovakia and Hungary 19 % of schools provided computers in classrooms in 2006. According to my survey in Slovak secondary schools, 25 % of them use ICT in classrooms. All of them use computers and projection, only over 40 % of them use interactive boards. What is more important for the development of regions and for achieving sustainable development, is the question whether schools use their ICT equipment also for life-long learning activities. All schools use their ICT equipment for out-of-school activities of their students, but only 50 % of schools allow to realise life-long learning activities with their ICT equipment and only 10 % of them open schools for family members to get IT skills.

It is difficult to express in exact numbers what various forms of ICT do when they are brought to various forms of education. Bringing ICT to schools will better prepare students for a life-long learning process. Anyway, the fact remains that they definitely change the teaching process and change the nature of the relationship between teachers and students, the way of their communication via emails and various forms of online communication, the way how to get and distribute information, networking. ICT allow practice gained knowledge through interactivity and provide simulations of real-world, what makes all education processes and students more active and better prepared for their future. Using ICT ensure that students know how to use their knowledge which can have an impact on the students themselves, on their future employers, on their communities etc.

The level of the regions depends not only on its potentials and shortcomings, but especially on how it handles them and how it can activate and use its strengths. Life-long learning and ICT become functional to re-establish the viability of peripheral areas.

The ICT sector especially in the region of Bratislava is developing and growing very fast. More than 34 % of all new companies in the IT sector in 2010 have been registered in the region of Bratislava. In 2008 over 31 % of jobs in the region were created by IT sector companies. The IT sector has changed from hardware selling to services with higher added value. Universities and schools try to keep up with the trend. Governments in Slovakia also recognise the benefits of ICT in enhancing the quality of services that they provide for residents, businesses and visitors, and improving internal efficiencies by lowering costs and increasing productivity. Unfortunately, using ICT in government is far behind the private sector development. We can see slow increase in the field of obtaining information, sending completed forms by individuals and companies to government institutions. In Slovakia in 2004 only 18 % of enterprises returned completed forms online, in 2009 it was 59 % of them. Slovakia, with around 25 % of citizens obtaining information from public authorities' web sites and 15 % of citizens sending filled forms, is somewhere in the middle of ranking. Despite huge globalization in the IT sector some market gaps still exist for small or medium local companies for example in the field of mobile communication, internet etc.

Dr. Lise Herslund – University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Looking ahead: Broadening and intensifying the network

I enjoyed particiapting in the EYF as supervisor for Antje Matern. I got an insight into a German case study on the metropolitan region around Hamburg and established some networks to the HafenCity University where Antje is a research assistant and PhD-student. Coming from outside Germany, it was interesting to get an insight into the German University world and regional studies.

The international perspective of the EYF could be developed even further in the future – to give more students and supervisors from outside Germany the same opportunities of widening their insights on particular issues and case studies. The future programme set-up – including a larger number of participants – could include smaller forum groups where in-depth discussions about particular topics and questions can be considered alongside the general issues of the overall theme. These could also be beneficial for the supervisors broadening their knowledge whilst supporting the discussions with their experience.

First meeting (left to right): Lise Herslund and Antje Matern working together at the first workshop in Leipzig in 2009

Dr. Marco Pütz

Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

Since July 2006 Dr. Marco Pütz is Head of the Research Group Regional Economics and Development, at the Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research in Birmensdorf, Switzerland. He is the Author of the chapter "Economy" in the Fischer Weltalmanach 2009 (in German). Some of his academic memberships and positions include: Member of the Management Committee of the COST Action TU0902 "Integrated assessment technologies to support the sustainable development of urban areas" (2009–2013); Member of the Management Committee of the COST Action IS0802 "Transformations in Global Environmental Governance" (2008–2012); Co-Chair, Working Group 2 "Multi-level Governance". Some of his current research projects are: Analysis of climatic risks and chances in Switzerland (financed by the Swiss federal ministry of environment); Adaptation to climate change in mountain areas: Case studie in the Saas valley; ESPON CLIMATE Climate Change and Territorial Effects on Regions and Local Economies – Case Study Alpine Space.

[http://www.wsl.ch/info/mitarbeitende/puetz/index_EN]

Marco Pütz

Climate change adaptation by spatial planning: New challenges, old problems

The term climate change adaptation refers to adjustments in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climate change. It also refers to effects that moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. Various types of adaptation can be identified, including anticipatory and reactive adaptation, private and public adaptation, and autonomous and planned adaptation. Adaptation depends on the adaptive capacity of communities, regions or sectors. Adaptive capacity is the ability of a system to adjust to climate change, to moderate potential damage, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with consequences; it includes adjustments in both behaviour and in resources and technologies. It has been argued that adaptive capacity is context specific and varies from country to country and region to region and within social groups and individuals. Consequently, different types of European regions are differently vulnerable to climate change, and different types of European regions need different, tailor-made mitigation and adaptation measures to be able to cope with climate change. Adaptive capacity also varies over time, responding to society's changing economic, institutional, political and social conditions. In order to identify adaptation options two complementary approaches can be distinguished (UKCIP): delivering adaptation actions, and building adaptive capacity.

According to the PEER report on comparing national adaptation strategies in Europe, water-related issues, agriculture, biodiversity, energy issues, human health and forestry are among the major concerns. Coastal zones and mountain areas are identified as being the most vulnerable areas. Agglomerations are particularly vulnerable in respect of heat island effects and given the density of population and infrastructure. The European Commission's green paper on adapting to climate change regards spatial planning as being important for adapting to climate change at regional level, while at local level efforts should focus on practical land use and land management techniques and on raising awareness. Spatial planning could provide an integrated framework to link vulnerability and risk assessment to adaptive capacities and adaptation responses, thus facilitating the identification of policy options and cost-efficient strategies.

Drawing on the project CLISP (Climate Change Adaptation by Spatial Planning in the Alpine Space) as a case study the presentation discussed the adaptive capacity of the spatial planning systems of six Alpine countries. Six evaluation criteria in combination with stakeholders were identified: political framework, planning legislation and instruments, knowledge, vertical and horizontal coordination, resources, and finally experiments, pilot projects and good practices.

Due to Europe's need to adapt, new challenges for spatial planning have emerged. Planning with growing uncertainties requires the development of more scenarios at local and regional level. Planning the future also involves dealing with today's buildings and infrastructure. Shrinking, relocation and downscaling might be appropriate planning responses to climate change. Climate adaptation strategies of spatial planning might shift the planning focus to critical infrastructures, risk prevention, climate mainstreaming, climate proofing, low carbon planning and zero emission cities. Regardless of these new challenges, some familiar problems remain critical for the role and impact of spatial planning. After all, complexity, uncertainty, and balancing stakeholders' interests are not new features of spatial planning. Moreover, the lack of financial resources, modest effectiveness, implementation deficits, the negotiation of land-use conflicts, power asymmetries, and conflicts between short-term and long-term goals remain familiar problems impacting on spatial planning's effectiveness. Finally, the crucial question remains unanswered: how do you adapt if you do not know exactly what to adapt to?

PANEL 3: Climate Change

3.1 Integration of mitigation into spatial policy: Comparing Leipzig and Bratislava

Christian Strauß
University of Leipzig and Fraunhofer Institute for Central and Eastern Europe, Leipzig, Germany

Christian Strauß analysed in which way urban planning includes climate protection measures looking at development strategies of the cities of Leipzig and Bratislava. Neither city has a complete energy strategy yet integrating spatial and energy policy. Regarding public transport Leipzig has the more effective strategy. Both cities have not yet activated all of their potentials although energetic improvement can be implemented within already existing urban structures.
Supported by the EYF Christian Strauß took part in the "Second international conference on Climate Change: Impacts and Responses" in Brisbane (Australia) in 2010 where his contribution had been selected in the call for papers. In his research he was supported by Professor Dr. Maroš Finka and Professor Dr. Jan Szolgay from Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava.

Future strategies and measures of spatial development will increasingly focus on climate challenges. Sustainable spatial development will entail adapting cities and urban regions to the requirements of energy-optimised urban structures and the consequences of climate change (cf. Mörsdorf et al. 2009). Reducing energy is one objective of sustainable climate policy.

The empirical part of the project is based on a comparison between policy strategies in the two European cities, Bratislava and Leipzig. The comparison has been realised by collecting data regarding challenges and also by a content analysis of the existing concepts.

The challenge of integrating energy policy into spatial development can be compared with the experience gained through coping with other forms of change. Based on these experiences, a main hypothesis has been defined: Current urban strategies in both cities do not include the topic of mitigation as it is discussed in theory. In the following part the hypothesis will be proved empirically.

Methodology

For the methodology in the project a concept has been developed which differs between so called "linear" and emergent strategies. Spatial planning concepts contain measures which contribute to a development of a city which is energetically optimised. One example for this is the principle of a compact (so called "European") city with mixed uses of urban functions and a high density. These spatial patterns lead to a reduction of energy consumption because they minimise traffic. But on the other hand, reducing energy consumption is not the main objective which refers expressly to the energetic optimisation but a target in the concept.

The examples of compactness and mixed uses as spatial objectives show that objectives can exist which contribute to an energetic optimisation without being expressly defined. These objectives are named "emergent" (cf. Mintzberg 1994): They are not defined but they are integrated into other objectives. Therefore it is necessary to analyse them "by reading between the lines".

Concerning the methodology it is not possible to analyse emergent strategies with every method. The best way to analyse emergent strategies is to carry out expert interviews as it is also

possible to ask the expert about his motivations and about the content, to "read between the lines". Analysing a document with a content analysis is more difficult than comprehending emergent content. At least this has got more of an interpretive form than a collection of information. In addition, there is scientific discussion if the emergent objective should be consequently ignored because the actor who has defined the objectives has not expressed the energetic topic – it is just an interpretation from the reader of that objective.

At least, for the empirical part it is difficult to analyse objectives in the sense of "emergent content". Two methodological problems have to be named:

- The problem of recognising an energy-related content: Has the spatially related objective also got an effect on the energetic structure of the space?
- The problem of the intention: Has the subject which has defined the objective also intended the emergent objective?

In the project emergent objectives have not been analysed because of these two methodological problems. On the other hand, the expressly defined energy-related objectives have been examined. Therefore, a document analysis has been done which is based on the collection of information (and not on the statistic interpretation of the content in the documents).

In both cities two documents have been analysed: the comprehensive plan of the city development and also the (sectoral) energy concept. In Leipzig the energy concept for the whole city is in progress. Therefore the concept, which has been developed for one district in the city within the research project "The sun is rising in the East!", has been chosen.

Comparing the concepts of Bratislava and Leipzig

Both cities face the challenge of meeting the energy demand in the near future. Linear strategies for energetic improvement have been formulated in sectoral energy concepts. For example, the energy concept of Bratislava from November 2007 expresses (cf. Magistrát hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy 2007: 30) that for the increasing electricity consumption it is necessary to construct new generating capacity. Besides nuclear energy Bratislava focuses on water and geothermal power.

In contrast, the energy supply of Leipzig still focuses on brown coal and more and more on regenerative resources. The municipal multi-utility Stadtwerke Leipzig GmbH (SWL) provides for investment in the energy and heating supply (cf. SWL 2009). A debate is currently underway concerning the city's energy development. A quantitative target for reducing CO_2 emissions by the year 2020 is currently being drawn up through Leipzig's involvement in the European Energy Award and the drafting of its Energy and Climate Protection Concept.

In both cities strategic urban concepts exist. In May 2007 in Bratislava the "Land Use Plan" was passed by the city council (cf. Hlavné mesto Slovenskej republiki Bratislava 2007). In Leipzig the "integrated urban development concept" (cf. Stadt Leipzig 2009) was passed in May 2009. Energy is relevant in the concepts, but mostly in the sectoral chapter of technical infrastructure in Leipzig and alternatively in the chapter "Nature and Landscape" in the land-use plan of Bratislava. In the other sectoral chapters and in the concluding chapter only emergent strategies concerning energy policy have been formulated. Unlike the energy concepts, the comprehensive concepts contain only a few energy related spatial objectives which are expressly defined.

In both cities, the requirements of strategic concepts for spatial and energy policy led to the drafting of parallel but separate strategies. An integrated, cooperative approach has not yet become established in the policy area of energy. In addition, there are only few perspectives covering individual areas going beyond consideration of specific buildings and developing concrete solutions at a level lower than a city-wide level. Ultimately, aims, strategies and measures need to be identified which equally serve expressly both spatial development and energy policy – which at the end of the day is the reason why the two policy areas need to be combined.

In Leipzig, the previous and current debate of urban development has not integrated energetic aspects in the same intensity as other topics like social aspects or economic development. But at

least the responsible actors know this and try to improve the energy policy field. A collaborative project has been the project "The sun is rising in the East! Energetic spatial concept for Leipzig's East Side" which has developed an integrative concept for energetic spatial development in one district and which has followed a bottom up approach. In contrast to the Energy and Climate Protection Concept which has been developed for the whole city, in Leipzig's East Side, solutions have been discussed with the owners of the buildings and the public utilities in the district. The discussions have followed the principle of integrating spatial and energy policy. In particular, the collaborative project was able to make systematic observations from an individual, quarter-based and district-based perspective, whereas the Energy and Climate Protection Concept's approach concentrated on the city as a whole. The two projects augment each other and contribute to the holistic perception of Leipzig's energy system. While the possibility of using the method employed in the BMBF project of drafting the Energy and Climate Protection Concept was discussed, the different ways in which the system is viewed (grassroots – city-wide) reveals the necessary parallel observation and the valuable addition.

Concerning energy related projects there are several initiatives in both cities. For example in Bratislava a project funded by the European Union has focused on the behaviour of the inhabitants in the district of "Vrakuna" (cf. The Vrakuna campaign n.d.). A vision for the future has been formulated which has been based on the real needs of the district's inhabitants. Important aspects of the project have been cooperation, communication structures and public involvement. Also technical measures have been realised.

One of the big differences between both cities is the problem of public transport. In Leipzig there have been a lot of investments in public transport which have also led to energy reduction. New pilot projects focus on e-mobility. In contrast to Leipzig there has been only little improvement in Bratislava although the land-use plan defines objectives and measures in the policy field. Therefore there has been only little reduction in energy consumption in this sector. Since 2008 Bratislava has been taking part in a research project "sustainable mobility" funded by the United Nation Development Programme (UNDP). The implementation is planned to be completed by 2014 (UNDP 2007).

A difference concerns the question of actors. In Leipzig not only public authorities have begun to develop strategies, like preparing an application for the European Energy Award or finding adaptive strategies, but also some private groups have discussed and realised interesting solutions in this field. For example there are two districts which have not up until this point been refurbished on the whole, but the owners and the inhabitants of the buildings have now initiated bottom up plans to develop their district themselves. The possibilities of energetic improvement are discussed together with a lot of other demands and objectives.

Conclusion and outlook

Within the discussion about reducing energy consumption the debate of realising zero emission cities becomes stronger (cf. IWU 2002). In contrast to new towns like Masdar City in Abu Dhabi, (cf. Masdar PV n.d.) it is very difficult to realise zero emission structures in pre-existing cities like Leipzig and Bratislava. Although there are some initiatives in other European cities, because of socio economic challenges (financing the refurbishment) and also cultural restrictions (protecting cultural heritage) this is not realistic. At the least, it is necessary to show how zero emission structures would change the shape of a city and the way the society lives before the necessity of discussing the cultural, social and economic values which the society would like to keep or to give up. In this best sense of sustainability not the best technical solution will be declared as the overall objective but a solution which is shared jointly by the different groups in the city.

Hence, a sustainable governing process should not only follow a top down approach to discuss operationalising the overall objectives of reducing energy consumption, but also take into account the potential perspectives of the people at the site. An integrative spatial concept which includes mitigation is necessary to realise sustainable spatial development and also to create innovations.

Both cities have got a specific local situation with energy related challenges. That is why on the one hand there are also specific challenges for sustainable forms of energy policy. But on the

other hand the transformation processes has got a lot of similarities. That is why it is useful to share experiences with each other and also to use methods and results of existing projects to improve urban development in both cities. But it is always necessary to find out if they are exactly transferable or if a modification is required.

In both cities "energetic truth" is connected with linear and emergent strategies. In Bratislava the problems of public transport are higher than in Leipzig. There are problems of implementing the goals of reducing energy into actions of the owners, in that there are differences between the property ownership structures: In Bratislava there are challenges to have joint actions in the concrete building, in Leipzig it is difficult to implement the measures against the background of demographic change.

On the whole, the analysis of linear strategies shows that compared to theoretical concepts there are more potentials than what is currently planned in urban development. The main hypothesis has to be put into place.

In future, it would be valuable to develop a methodological concept for analysing also emergent strategies. Based on the current and the future results of the project, the knowledge transfer between both cities and their responsible actors should be strengthened. Therefore, at this moment an application for a joint research project is in preparation.

It would also be wise to transfer methods and experiences to other cities with similar challenges in the transformation process. Therefore, the further research cooperation between Leipzig University and Technical University of Bratislava has been agreed.

References

Hlavné mesto Slovenskej republiki Bratislava (2007): Územného plán hlavného mesta sr bratislavy. Bratislava.

IWU – Institut Wohnen und Umwelt GmbH, ZIV – Zentrum für integrierte Verkehrssysteme (2002): Zero Emission City. Darmstadt.

Magistrát hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy (2007): Koncepcia rozvoja hlavného mesta slovenskej republiky bratislavy v oblasti tepelnej energetiky. Bratislava.

Masdar PV (no date): Die Masdar Initiative. http://www.masdarpv.com/masdar_initiative.html, 2011-02-14.

Mintzberg, H. (1994): The Rise and the Fall of Strategic Planning. Harlow.

Mörsdorf, F. L.; Ringel, J.; Strauß, C. (eds.) (2009): Anderes Klima. Andere Räume! Zum Umgang mit Erscheinungsformen des veränderten Klimas im Raum. Norderstedt.

SWL Stadtwerke Leipzig (2009): Mittelfristplanung 2020 („SWL 2020"). http://www.leipzig.de/imperia/md/content/61_stadtplanungsamt/SEKO_Leipzig_Karten_Teil_B6_9.pdf, 2010-06-23.

Stadt Leipzig (2009): Integriertes Stadtentwicklungskonzept (SEKo) Leipzig 2020. Leipzig.

The Vrakuna campaign (no date): Vrakuna – becoming a stable part of Europe (a leader from the periphery). http://www.display-campaign.org/example494.html?PHPSESSID=9oqien2940gbdihfssht67ook5, 2011-02-14.

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme (2007): Inition Plan for a GEF Project Preparation Grant (PPG). http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/cst/show/7163AAB1-F203-1EE9-B09EFC8727ECF34F, 2011-02-14.

3.2 Climate change strategies for rural areas in selected European countries

The National Adaptation Strategies (NASs)

Asli Tepecik-Dis
Nordregio – Nordic Centre for Spatial Development, Stockholm

Asli Tepecik-Dis focused her research project on adaptation strategies for rural areas affected by climate change. In a close cooperation with Dr. Gerd Lintz from the Leibniz Institute of Ecological and Regional Development in Dresden, she had a closer look at the National Adaptation Strategies of selected European countries. Her aim was, to find out, how these strategies implicate especially rural areas and in what way they deal with adaptation as well as with mitigation within one integrated strategy.
As a visiting scientist at the IÖR in Dresden, Asli took the opportunity to learn more about the German perspective – one of several points of views she as a Turkish citizen living and working in Sweden can consider in her research projects.

Introduction

The main aim of the comparative study "Climate change strategies for rural areas in selected European countries: The National Adaptation Strategies (NASs)" has been to provide a systematic overview of different national approaches to developing strategies for climate change adaptation from a rural development perspective on a Europe-wide scope and to analyse the consequences for policy and research under the umbrella of the Territorial Agenda. While the discussions on the definition of rural areas are vast, in this study, the definition provided by The European Charter for Rural Areas (a report by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe) has been considered which describes rural areas with the following:

"A countryside where the main part of the land is used for agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries, natural reserves and other non-urban recreation areas."

The European cohesion policy has brought a new emphasis on the characteristics of different places as it is a territorially oriented policy and the unique set of assets, problems and potentials of specific places constitute its core. As regions are encouraged to develop their own local potential, steps necessary for improving conditions for rural areas and producing local resources that are specific for each region should be taken. Thus, this study has also intended to contribute to the implementation of the territorial dimension of the EU policies, namely Territorial Cohesion.

Climate change is a phenomenon that will aggravate existing environmental, economic and social challenges being experienced across the world. Whilst the global attempts to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions have increased considerably, there is still an urgent need to develop adaptation strategies together with mitigation in order to adjust to the unavoidable effects of climate change.

Climate change impacts are experienced differently depending on the territorial characteristics of the regions, yet rises in temperature could be beneficial for tourism, agriculture or for energy savings, especially for the Nordic regions. On the other hand it increases uncertainties since flooding and drought threaten biodiversity all over the world.

European Union governance context on a changing climate

Climate change adaptation strategies have become priorities for most of the countries in the European Union (EU) and the guidance for adaptation has mainly come from the top; the national level (i.e. National Adaption Strategies) and the EU level (i.e. EU White Paper on climate change adaptation) as well as European Commission's Green Paper, *Adapting to climate change in Europe – options for EU action*. The EU as a governing institution is a key actor in the global climate change debate and related policy responses. With its joint focus on policies, as in the example of Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and rural development programmes; the EU context provides a potential platform for the integration of policies which can also be an important actor in integrating adaptation and mitigation actions into its policy frameworks.

The current perception of rural development in the EU's CAP has an emphasis on agricultural dimension. Agriculture due to its high dependency on climatic conditions is and will be the most vulnerable field of economic activity in the future. The changing climate will most likely lead to a series of effects in different geographical areas of Europe, ranging from crop and stock variety to land use which may threaten agriculturally sustained economies particularly at local level where individual actions control the use of land. Adaptation measures like the conservation of population in rural areas, managing the increase in agricultural products and settlement re-organisation will be necessary in the upcoming years.

Thus a new thinking is needed and policies should harness opportunities and deal with constraints gradually in order to successfully establish and maintain sustainable practices.

Setting the scene

More than 30% of all human-caused greenhouse gas emissions are linked to agriculture and land use worldwide (Scherr, Sthapit 2009: 32–49). Considering the fact that approximately 91% of the territory of the EU is rural and home to more than 56% of the EU's population, it is obvious that agriculture is the most dominant European land use activity and therefore evaluation of possible impacts arising from climate change on European agriculture is essential in the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Northern Europe will likely experience widespread precipitation while droughts are expected to increase in southern domain. This North and South divide of climatic effects in the European continent will have a dramatic effect on rural economic activities. The agricultural sector needs to be at the core of strategies for transformation of energy systems due to inherent significant mitigation potential. In case of adaptation measures, opportunities arise with the development of climate tolerant tools and methods which can accommodate the foreseen changes and also help developing technologies that are more resource-use-efficient. A recent study conducted by PICCMAT[1] found that adaptation has a lower cost until high stabilization levels are met.

On the other hand, a major hypothesis argues that adaptation measures should focus on increased resilience to change on climatic variability, since adaptation implies not only dealing with changes in temperature and rainfall, but also with increasing variability and greater frequency of extreme weather events. In particular, adaptation in agriculture leads to adjusting the timing and location of cropping activities and fertiliser rates, using more efficient irrigation techniques so that rural areas can tackle the diverse effects of climate change and ensure climate resilient cropping systems.

Recent literature in the field of climate change calls for addressing the synergies between adaptation to and mitigation of climate change rather than dealing with them separately. (Olensen, Bindi 2002; Abildtrup et.al. 2006; Swart, Raes 2007; Venema, Rehman 2007; Hamin, Gurran 2009; Laukkonen et al. 2009; Biesbroek et al. 2009).

1 The Policy Incentives for Climate Change Mitigation Agricultural Techniques (PICCMAT) research project (DG RTD/FP6), launched in January 2007, aims to identify farming practices that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to suggest policy instruments to support the necessary changes in land management to stakeholders and policy makers. (http://www.climatechangeintelligence.baastel.be/piccmat/index.php)

The formation of a new concept can initiate a new focus and thus draw attention to the role of "smart" planning which can integrate both measures with the concept of "adaptigation". Adaptigation is beyond mitigation and adaptation; the concept integrates a focus on adaptation with a focus on mitigation, to avoid conflicts and create synergies" (Langlais 2009). The potential synergy between the adaptation and mitigation actions can help to develop policy measures that would reduce the adverse impacts of climate change and also harness potential benefits that rural areas could meet.

Methodological concerns

As a first step, a questionnaire was distributed to all national authorities in EU 27 to obtain an overview of national and regional developments on rural policy and distinguish emerging patterns of response to climate change. To do so, firstly national contact points for European Environment Agency were identified in each member country to determine relevant authorities for the inquiries. The authorities referred were mainly the Ministries of Agriculture in relation to rural development plans and climate change related work. However, the responses further pointed out that there are several ministries, agencies, institutes involved in this theme. The preliminary data has shown interesting trends and formed an integral part of the research for this project and the content of the responses provided a sufficient basis for deriving the main messages and making a credible analysis of the approaches to climate change in terms of rural areas. Nonetheless, more responses would be needed in order to get detailed account for national trends and development potentials throughout Europe.

Secondly a desktop study as the major empirical part of this study – a review of NASs was undertaken based on ESPON´s (European Spatial Development Observation Network) Drivers, Opportunities and Constraints (D.O.C) framework[2] regarding its contextual relevance to understand the formulation of climate adaptation strategies from a rural development point of view. The following phase involved developing an analytical framework for testing principles in the NASs of the countries in question. Finally, a comparative analysis of strategies was conducted in the selected countries, namely; Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. This selection was based on the availability of the documents in English at the time of writing. Empirical findings obtained from the pilot study helped to form an analysis of recent development patterns together with conceptual debates and literature sources by focusing on whether the policy orientations of the territorial agenda and national strategies address the issue of the potential interactions between climate change and rural areas and if so, in what way this can contribute the overall aim of the Territorial Cohesion.

Main Results

The survey indicated that climate change has become a "driver of change", by reshaping rural development plans especially under the EU's Framework for rural development programmes during the period of 2007–2013. In the NASs, agriculture and forestry are each given their own subsection and the practices are diverse as assumed, due to the variability of climate as well as cultural, institutional, and economic factors; besides the nature of the interactions between these. Concrete measures for climate change impacts are rather expressed through the rural development programmes in the respective member states but not explicitly through the NASs which have a general focus on identifying unavoidable consequences of a changing climate and dealing with the question of how to integrate the potential adaptation responses into sectoral responsibilities. While sharing similar goals, the strategic approaches to climate change differ largely depending on the geographic specificities, the assessments of the current and future vulnerabilities besides the institutional capacity to adapt to the likely impacts of climate change. In broad spectrum, actions have been undertaken in the field of water, landscape and coastal management. For agriculture, several measures and instruments concerning energy, water, soil and biodiversity management are present. Land use practices, crop and cultivar choice as well as technologies to manage the efficient use of energy and water have been identified as integral factors in responding to climate change in years to come. Whilst these factors will contribute to lower carbon release, it will also help sensitization of the farmers and provide information for

2 The framework was a part of the ESPON Applied Research Project 2013/1/2 on European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas (EDORA).

scientific research. The countries reviewed are addressing the issues mentioned above in a very general manner, with no concrete implementation mechanisms provided. Thus, recommendations in the NASs are assessed as to be vague and too general.

Drivers in the countries' context

Main drivers in the countries' context have been associated with extreme weather events, the ongoing work on adaptation in the neighbouring countries and the growing evidence that climate is a scientific fact as documented by the IPCC's assessments. Depending on the country's institutional context and resource base, other drivers include government policy initiatives, financial cost assessments and political will.

Opportunities for Rural Areas

The impacts of climate change are likely to be most severe for those sectors that are climate-dependent, with agriculture being the most vulnerable sector. There is likely to be significant opportunity for northern European regions to increase agricultural production; in contrast, Mediterranean regions may have the greatest risk of reduced crop yields and water supply. An opportunity that Member States can exercise in deciding standards for good agricultural and environmental praxis would be to let the most suitable and localised management practices emerge along with the evolution of adaptation experience. The likely impacts of climate change present opportunities to improve the international competitiveness of agriculture and innovation; yet again no concrete implementation tools or mechanisms are mentioned as how the potential opportunities would be realised.

Constraints

Results indicate the lack of financial assistance as a barrier in tackling climate change. Nonetheless, measures taken at a certain geographic scale (local/regional area, etc.) may be limited in their effect if a range of drivers across different spatial scales are not taken into account. Adaptation at various spatial scales is the cheapest option for reducing the adverse impacts of climate change in the long term. Institutional capacity is another challenge, since regional or territorial sections may face an increasing demand for management interventions and protective measures, due to an increasing frequency of extreme weather events, and their consequences (e.g. major floods, excess inland water etc.)

Concluding Remarks

During the last decades, the focus had been generally placed on mitigation measures however as of recently, adaptation has taken over the policy agenda as in the example of NASs. Still, the integration of both measures (adaptigation) can contribute further to the main objective of sustainable development and thus resilience of rural areas in particular. Although aspects of integration are not concretely mentioned, the strategies recognise the importance of synergies between both measures as well. Therefore, there is a need for an integrated approach to foster synergies and avoid conflicts of mitigation and adaptation measures as well as their interactions with other policy objectives.

The empirical results also indicate that as more issues get linked to climate change, the whole theme becomes less practical. With a focus on more concrete activities especially with place specific tools and methods, better results can be achieved. Thus far, research on climate change has provided information with likely environmental impacts; however the multifaceted indirect socio-economic consequences which will be felt differently depending on the scale and the place also need to be reviewed.

It has been beyond the scope of this study to identify specific measures or policy options for each country, or region due to the context-dependant nature of mitigation and especially adaptation. However this study illuminates a number of possible ways for the institutions at the national level to make better use of the potential synergies between climate change adaptation and mitigation as well as the sectors covered in rural development, although only agriculture has been highlighted here.

Climate change calls for collective actions to achieve economic, environmental, and social cohesion and it is most properly addressed in the context of sustainable development. The aim of achieving Territorial Cohesion cannot be realised without serious consideration of different types of territories which would include rural areas. The consideration of different geographic specificities may be overlooked, thus placing planners and politicians under obligation to look and work for a more diverse array of actors and knowledge.

Europe considers spatial approach as a joint vision that pursues new directions for a sustainable future. The role of spatial planning should come into play here as it is strategically addressed in the core aim of the Territorial Cohesion and embedded in European spatial development perspective (ESDP 1999). Thus, it can be considered as a practical application with a joint spatial approach. Continuous dialogue with a wide range of actors, engaging and empowering stakeholders are essential to create a robust knowledge base which would also provide tools for decision makers and assist other players to adapt. It is about reallocation of funds where a more focused approach is placed on a continuous dialogue and concrete delivery mechanisms which would then justify the contribution of cohesion policy and bring to light why place matters.

References

Abildtrup, J.; Andsley, E.; Fekete-Farkas, M.; Guipponi, C.; Gylling, M.; Rosato, P.; Rounsevell, M. (2006): Socio-economic Scenario Development for the Assessment of Climate Change, Impacts on Agricultural Land Use: A Pairwise Comparison Approach. In: Environment Science and Policy (9), 101–115.

Biesbroek, G.; Swart, R.; van der Knaap, W. (2009): The mitigation-adaptation dichotomy and the role of spatial planning. In: Habitat International 33 (3), 230–237.

Commission of the European Communities: Green Paper from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions. Adapting to climate change in Europe – options for EU action. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0354en01.pdf, 2011-02-15.

Hamin, E.; Gurran, N. (2009): Urban form and climate change: Balancing adaptation and mitigation in the U.S. and Australia. In: Habitat International 33 (3), 238–245.

Laukkonen, J.; Blancob, P.; Lenhartc, J.; Keinerd, M.; Cavrice, B.; Kinuthia-Njengaf, C. (2009): Combining climate change adaptation and mitigation measures at the local level. In: Habitat International 33 (3), 287–292.

Olensen, J.O.; Bindi, M. (2002): Consequences of climate change for European agricultural productivity, land use and policy. In: European Journal of Agronomy 16 (4), 239–262.

Scherr, S.; Sthapit, S. (2009): Farming and Land Use to Cool the Planet. http://www.worldwatch.org/files/pdf/SOW09_chap3.pdf, 2011-02-15.

Swart, R.; F. Raes (2007): Making integration of adaptation and mitigation work: mainstreaming into sustainable development policies? In: Climate Policy 7 (4), 288–303.

Venema, H.; Rehman I. H. (2007): Decentralized renewable energy and the climate change mitigation-adaptation nexus. In: Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 12 (5), 875–900.

Professor Dr. Jan Szolgay – Slovak University of Technology Bratislava, Slovakia

Intensifying Cross Sectoral Communication

The EYF enabled me to meet spatial planning experts and young professionals with diverse backgrounds, which was an overall positive experience. Coming from a discipline a bit apart from spatial planning, all meetings were an enrichment to me professionally. The perspective of spatial planners toward the problems tackled in the individual projects of the young professionals both from the point of view of their profession itself and their various national cultural backgrounds gave me knowledge and skills for future cross sectoral communication. I started to use these skills already in my profession with regards to flood protection in Slovakia, where we will introduce a new strategy in which spatial and urban planning will have to play a much stronger role than in the past. I was able to co-edit a special issue of a Slovak journal Urbanita on water, where we also discussed the role of the cooperation between our two communities with regard to water in the landscape.

With regards to intercultural communication the project gave me the opportunity to learn, but the applicability of the skill acquired will be limited to the participation on international projects, since the differences in planning cultures and especially those of the roles and legal support planning has in different countries, when compared to our practice, will probably not allow to apply these successfully in Slovakia.

Intercultural exchange: Jan Szolgay, Andreas Schweitzer, Axel Stein and Tatjana Fischer (foreground to background) during the second workshop in Dresden in 2009.